

UNIVERSAL  
LIBRARY



123 044

UNIVERSAL  
LIBRARY











# SIR GEORGE BYNG'S ACTION OFF SICILY, 11TH AUGUST, 1718.

FROM THE PICTURE BY RICHARD PATON AT GREENWICH HOSPITAL  
BY PERMISSION OF THE LORDS COMMISSIONERS OF THE ADMIRALTY

A Record of the Progress of the People  
*IN RELIGION, LAWS, LEARNING, ARTS, INDUSTRY, COMMERCE,  
SCIENCE, LITERATURE AND MANNERS, FROM THE EARLIEST  
TIMES TO THE PRESENT DAY*

EDITED BY

SOMETIME FELLOW OF ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE, OXFORD

AND

SOMETIME FELLOW OF TRINITY COLLEGE, OXFORD

VOLUME V. SECTION I

LONDON: CASSELL AND COMPANY, LIMITED

1909



# CONTENTS.

NOTES ON ILLUSTRATIONS . . . . .	PAGE ix
LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS . . . . .	xxxix
PREFATORY NOTE ( <i>J. S. Mann</i> ) . . . . .	xxxiii

## CHAPTER XVII.

### *THE AGE OF WALPOLE, WITH SOME OF THE PREPARATIONS FOR IT.*

THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY ( <i>H. D. Traill</i> ) . . . . .	1
POLITICAL HISTORY ( <i>Arthur Hassall</i> ) . . . . .	2
ENGLAND AND EUROPE ( <i>Arthur Hassall</i> ) . . . . .	10
THE ARMY ( <i>G. Le M. Gretton</i> ). . . . .	14
THE NAVY ( <i>W. Laird Clowes</i> ) . . . . .	25
EXPLORATION, 1642-1742 ( <i>Charles Raymond Beazley</i> ) . . . . .	31
ENGLISH LAW, 1689-1742 ( <i>F. C. Montague</i> ) . . . . .	47
PHILOSOPHY ( <i>T. Whittaker</i> ) . . . . .	56
NATURAL SCIENCE ( <i>T. Whittaker</i> ) . . . . .	62
MEDICINE AND PUBLIC HEALTH ( <i>D'Arcy Power</i> ) . . . . .	64
ENGLISH SCHOLARSHIP, 1670-1742 ( <i>J. E. Sandys</i> ) . . . . .	73
LITERATURE ( <i>George Saintsbury</i> ) . . . . .	96
PAINTING AND SCULPTURE ( <i>Reginald Hughes</i> ) . . . . .	114
HANDEL AND ENGLISH MUSIC ( <i>F. J. Crowest</i> ) . . . . .	118
AGRICULTURE, 1689-1742 ( <i>R. E. Prothero</i> ) . . . . .	130
THE PROGRESS OF MANUFACTURE ( <i>G. Townsend Warner</i> ) . . . . .	145
THE TAXES AND THE PEOPLE ( <i>A. L. Smith</i> ) . . . . .	155
SOCIAL LIFE ( <i>Mary Bateson</i> ) . . . . .	181
SCOTLAND ( <i>James Colville</i> ) . . . . .	208
IRELAND ( <i>P. W. Joyce</i> ) . . . . .	223
AUTHORITIES, 1714-1742 . . . . .	225

## CHAPTER XVIII.

## AN ERA OF NEW DEPARTURES. 1742-1784.

	PAGE
DOMESTIC POLITICS ( <i>Arthur Hassall</i> ) . . . . .	228
ENGLAND'S FOREIGN POLICY ( <i>Arthur Hassall</i> ) . . . . .	243
THE ARMY ( <i>G. Le M. Gretton</i> ) . . . . .	252
THE NAVY ( <i>W. Laird Clowes</i> ) . . . . .	277
EXPLORATION ( <i>Charles Raymond Beazley</i> ) . . . . .	292
NONCONFORMITY, 1689-1815 ( <i>John Brown</i> ) . . . . .	307
PHILOSOPHY AND SCIENCE ( <i>T. Whittaker</i> ) . . . . .	321
LITERATURE ( <i>George Saintsbury</i> ) . . . . .	333
THE REGENERATION OF ART ( <i>R. Hughes</i> ) . . . . .	360
BAKEWELL AND THE NEW FARMING ( <i>R. E. Prothero</i> ) . . . . .	403
THE PROGRESS OF MANUFACTURE ( <i>G. Townsend Warner</i> ) . . . . .	408
THE CANAL SYSTEM ( <i>G. Townsend Warner</i> ) . . . . .	435
FINANCE AND ECONOMICS ( <i>A. L. Smith</i> ) . . . . .	440
LABOUR AND PAUPERISM ( <i>A. L. Smith</i> ) . . . . .	454
SOCIAL LIFE ( <i>Mary Bateson</i> ) . . . . .	465
SCOTLAND ( <i>James Colville</i> ) . . . . .	485
IRELAND ( <i>P. W. Joyce</i> ) . . . . .	489
AUTHORITIES, 1742-1784 . . . . .	495

## LIST OF PLATES.

(*Brief Notes on some of these will be found with those on the remaining Illustrations.*)

SIR GEORGE BYNG'S ACTION OFF SICILY, 11TH AUGUST, 1718, BY RICHARD PATON . . . . .	<i>Frontispiece</i>
ROBERT WALPOLE, EARL OF ORFORD, IN THE STUDIO OF FRANCIS HAYMAN, R.A. . . . .	<i>To face page 1</i>
UNIFORMS OF THE BRITISH ARMY, 1742 . . . . .	23
THE OLD EAST INDIA WHARF, BY PETER MONAMY . . . . .	119
MAP OF THE BRITISH DOMINIONS IN NORTH AMERICA AFTER 1763, BY PETER BELL . . . . .	248
THE RAKE'S PROGRESS . . . . .	362
POTTERY FROM THE SCHREIBER COLLECTION . . . . .	429
"BE NOT AMAZED, DEAR MOTHER! IT IS INDEED YOUR DAUGHTER ANNE" . . . . .	484

# NOTES TO ILLUSTRATIONS.

## VOLUME V. SECTION I.



PAGE

SIR GEORGE BYNG'S ACTION OFF SICILY, 11TH AUGUST. 1718, BY  
RICHARD PATON . . . . . *Frontispiece*

ROBERT WALPOLE, EARL OF ORFORD, IN THE STUDIO OF FRANCIS  
HAYMAN, R.A. . . . . 1

Hayman (1708-1776), who is represented painting Walpole's portrait. lived to be the first librarian of the Royal Academy. This picture is by him.

SEAL OF GEORGE I. . . . . 2

On the obverse, the king in royal robes, wearing the collar of the Garter; Mercy on his right, Justice on his left. The shield of arms on the flag borne by the lion, and above the throne, exhibits England, impaling Scotland, France, Ireland; Brunswick, impaling Lüneburg; on a point in point, Saxony; in the centre of the fourth quarter, an escutcheon charged with the crown of Charles the Great, representing George I.'s Arch-Treasurership of the Holy Roman Empire. On the reverse, the king on horseback, with a distant view of London and the Thames, and an inscription containing the king's titles as Duke of Lüneburg and Brunswick, Arch-Treasurer of the Empire, and Elector of Hanover.

JAMES, FIRST EARL STANHOPE, BY SIR G. KNELLER . . . . . 3

COIN FROM A DIE OF JAMES EDWARD, THE PRETENDER . . . . .

A silver crown piece; the Pretender as James VIII., in armour, on the obverse; on the reverse, the arms of England, Scotland (twice), France and England quarterly, and Ireland. The die was made at Paris in 1716, by Norbert Roettier; but the coin was not struck until the dies had been acquired by a dealer in 1828. Similar coins, but with the title *Jacobus III.* and a shield of arms of England only on the reverse, had been struck in 1709; and dies had been made in 1716 for a guinea and probably a shilling, the one inscribed "*Jacobus VIII.*" and the other "*Jacobus Tertius*," with the king's bust, but otherwise like the contemporary English coins of these denominations. Grueber, *Handbook of the Coins of Great Britain and Ireland in the British Museum*.

ROBERT POWEL, THE PUPPET-SHOW MAN . . . . . 5

From "*A Second Tale of a Tub*," a book attributed to Bishop Burnet's son, Gilbert Burnet, Judge of the Court of Common Pleas, a gross attack on Robert Harley, Earl of Oxford, who is represented as managing the puppets. Robert Powel was a well-known puppet-show man of the period. His performances are described in the *Spectator*, Nos. 14 and 372.

AN ELECTION WON BY BRIBERY . . . . . 7

The full title of the print is "*The Prevailing Candidate, or the Election carried by Bribery and the Devil*." The Ministry secured a great majority at the election of 1722. Lines below describe the candidate as a minion of the devil. He is bribing a member of a



corporation. Till the Reform Bill of 1832, the right of election of borough members of Parliament was frequently vested in the corporations only, so that corruption was easy. The wooden shoes are emblems of French tyranny. The mirror shows that persons high in office behind the screen are prompting those in front. On the screen are names of M.P.'s unpopular at this time. Walpole's maxim notoriously was "Every man has his price."

THE HOUSE OF COMMONS IN 1742 . . . . .	9
Reproduced from an example in the National Portrait Gallery. Speaker Onslow is in the chair, and Sir Robert Walpole, who wears the ribbon of the Garter, is addressing the House.	

GEORGE II., BY JOHN SHACKLETON . . . . .	13
------------------------------------------	----

GIBRALTAR IN 1730, BY COQUART . . . . .	15
-----------------------------------------	----

PORTO BELLO IN 1740, BY LIEUT. DURELL . . . . .	17
-------------------------------------------------	----

The entrance was commanded on the left by Fort San Felipe de Todo Hierro (the "Iron Castle"); on the right, nearer the town, by Fort Santiago de la Gloria, and was raked by Fort San Geronymo, still higher up. These forts, however, were greatly out of repair, and destitute of guns. The English ships were ordered to fire at the Iron Castle in passing, but the breeze failed while they were abreast of it, and they therefore bombarded it heavily, drove the Spaniards out, landed, and climbed in through the embrasures, and the other forts surrendered next day. The enthusiasm aroused in England was out of all proportion to the achievement (Prof. T. K. Laughton in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, art. "Vernon").

PLAN OF CARTHAGENA IN 1741 . . . . .	19
--------------------------------------	----

By Captain Laws, who was engaged in the operations. The plan shows several successive positions. In front of the town is the British fleet as it anchored on March 4th, with the ships of Admiral Vernon (in the centre), Sir Chaloner Ogle, and Commodore Lestock, in the outer line; the two ships shown off Boca Grande are the *Lion* and the *Burford*, the former dismasted in taking the general to view the forts; the rest of the fleet is shown between the Boca Grande and the Boca Chica. Troops were landed on March 10 in boats shown to the right of the fleet; the boom across the Boca Chica was forced on March 23, and the transports are shown inside, with the fleet further in, as it was anchored on March 26. Finally, the squadron and the transports are shown further in, off the Castillo Grande and Fort Manzanilla, with five ships inside the bay "for the siege of the town." Wentworth's final assault, which failed, was made on Fort San Lazaro, on the hill at the back of the town, on April 9. A brief sketch of the siege is given in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, art. Vernon. See also *An Account of the Siege of Carthage*, 1741, attributed to Captain Knowles.

GENERAL JAMES WOLFE . . . . .	21
-------------------------------	----

UNIFORMS OF THE BRITISH ARMY, 1742 . . . . .	23
----------------------------------------------	----

These plates are reproduced from the volumes of "Historical Records of the British Army," published under the authority of the Adjutant-General and at the command of William IV., from 1834 to 1850. They are probably taken from contemporary drawings, extant at the War Office, but not accessible; cf. Vol. IV., note on illustration, p. 512. The 23rd Royal Welsh Fusiliers was raised in 1669 by Lord Herbert to operate against James II. in Ireland, and was at the Battle of the Boyne, at Namur, Blenheim, Oudenarde, Dettingen, and

Fontenoy; also at Bunker's Hill, in the Peninsular War, and at Waterloo. The 34th or Cumberland Regiment was raised in the Eastern Counties in 1702, and was at the siege of Gibraltar in 1727, at Fontenoy, Culloden, the American Revolution, and the Peninsular War, where it gained special distinction.

GENERAL WOLFE'S SWORD . . . . .	23
STATUETTE OF FREDERICK THE GREAT . . . . .	24
His great popularity in England is shown by the frequent representations of his person in pottery ware—statuettes, pictures on mugs, etc.	
MEDAL COMMEMORATING THE SEA-FIGHT OFF CAPE PASSARO, 1718 . . . . .	26
The Emperor Charles VI. and George I. are within the two laurel wreaths; between them a winged caduceus or staff of Mercury, rising from the hull of an antique galley decorated with flags. The motto is "They forbid treaties to be violated." On the obverse are sea-gods destroying the Spanish ships, with the motto, adapted from Virgil, <i>Æneid</i> V.: "Thus it is lawful to smoothe the disturbed waves," and an inscription embodying the date of the battle.	
MODEL OF THE ORIGINAL NORE LIGHTSHIP . . . . .	29
This was probably the first lightship put in position: the Dudgeon was placed a little later. These ships were old Dutch galliots, bought up by the English lighthouse authorities. The Dudgeon had its lights suspended at the ends of its cross-yards, "not unlike a Chinese junk celebrating a feast of lanterns." Cf. Williams in <i>Cassell's Magazine</i> , May, 1881; <i>Report of the Royal Commission on Lighthouses</i> , 1861.	
BARTHOLOMEW PORTUGUES . . . . .	32
SIR HENRY MORGAN . . . . .	33
CAPTAIN WILLIAM DAMPIER, R.N., BY THOMAS MURRAY . . . . .	34
THE ISTHMIUS OF PANAMA . . . . .	35
THE EASTERN SEAS, AS KNOWN ABOUT 1686 . . . . .	37
Cf. the Dutch map reproduced in Vol. IV., p. 761. It will be noted that New Guinea is still shown as a promontory of New Holland.	
DAMPPIER'S PASSAGE AND SHARKS' BAY, N.W. AUSTRALIA . . . . .	39
COSTUME OF NATIVE CALIFORNIAN WOMEN . . . . .	41
Made respectively of birds' skins and deerskin.	
INHABITANTS OF THE DANUBIAN COUNTRIES . . . . .	44
Edward Browne or Brown (1644-1708) was physician to Charles II., and travelled much on the Continent, visiting Styria, Carinthia, Buda-Pesth, and even Thessaly.	
JOHN ELIOT, THE APOSTLE OF THE INDIANS . . . . .	45
Eliot's Indian Bible, published in 1663, preserves the language of the Massachusetts Indians, long extinct otherwise. This portrait, reproduced in Appleton, <i>Cyclopædia of American Biography</i> , is probably derived from some early original.	
THE QUAKER EMIGRATION TO AMERICA . . . . .	46
Mr. Ebsworth, the editor of the "Bagford Ballads," suggests that a Fritazier may mean an Indian "medicine man" or magician, a class	

supposed to be in close relations with the Great Spirit. Jeremiah Ives and Thomas Hicks were Puritan writers against Quakerism between 1655 and 1679. The last verses are a libel on the Quakers, who were always friendly with the Indians.

A COMMONS' COMMITTEE ON THE FLEET PRISON, 1729, BY HOGARTH . . . . . 48

Painted for Sir Archibald Grant of Monymusk. The Committee was appointed on February 5, 1728-9, on the motion of General Oglethorpe, to inquire into the conduct of Thomas Bambridge, warden of the Fleet Prison for debtors. They reported that he had allowed debtors to escape, had been guilty of gross breaches of his trust, high crimes and misdemeanours, and great cruelties to his prisoners. He escaped, however, without severe punishment. The members were: General Oglethorpe (chairman), Lord Morpeth, Lord Inchiquin, Lord Percival, Sir Gregory Page, Sir Archibald Grant of Monymusk, Sir James Thornhill the painter, Sir Andrew Pountaine, General Wade, Captain Vernon, R.N., Francis Child, and William Hicks. Bambridge is on the extreme left (*Catalogue* of the National Portrait Gallery).

THE SHERIFFS' COURT IN 1709 . . . . . 49

From a mutilated tariff of coach fares, etc., issued by the Court.

A COURT OF LAW ABOUT 1733 . . . . . 53

From a satirical print of about that date, representing the Court of King's Bench sitting in the upper part of Westminster Hall, then used as a law court. The twelve men seated with their backs to the spectator are probably a jury; one seems to be receiving a bribe. On the spectator's left, a lawyer receiving a fee; in the centre, a disappointed suitor; on the right, a group trying to settle a case. The wolf is, of course, emblematic of costs. The flags are apparently a French flag, with Louis XIV.'s emblem, a Turkish flag, and a flag with crossed scimitars, probably taken from the corsairs of Tunis or Algiers (*Cf. Catalogue of Satirical Prints in the British Museum*, III., No. 1990).

FRANCIS HUTCHESON . . . . . 57

GEORGE BERKELEY, AFTERWARDS BISHOP OF CLOYNE . . . . . 59

JOSEPH BUTLER, BISHOP OF DURHAM . . . . . 61

MEDAL COMMEMORATING MATTHEW TINDAL THE DEIST . . . . . 62

Tindal, holding a Bible, tramples on the Beast of the Apocalypse (the Roman Church); the legend signifies "In dispelling clouds." On the reverse is the date of his death and the legend "Greater at its setting," referring to the sun above; also the legend, "My country only is sweet to me," and below, "Wise beyond measure." He had been a Romanist, but returned to Protestantism, and published his most important book, which was Rationalistic, at 73.

CARICATURE OF THOMAS GUY, BY R. GRAVE . . . . . 66

The son of a lighterman and coal dealer of London, Guy became a bookseller in Charles II.'s reign, and eventually, from about 1679 to 1691, University printer at Oxford. He had been brought up at Tamworth, and represented that place in Parliament. He speculated successfully in South Sea Stock, and gave largely to St. Thomas's Hospital, also founding Guy's Hospital, which was originally intended to be an annexe of St. Thomas's, and leaving £200,000 to it in his will. He was extremely penurious in his personal expenditure, but gave largely to philanthropic objects, and left considerable legacies

to various relatives. The attack on him seems, therefore, to have had little, if any, foundation.

GUY'S HOSPITAL: A PROSPECT OF ONE OF THE WARDS IN 1725 . . . 67

From a print in the Grace collection, published in 1725. A comparison of this prison-like ward, with its unwholesome bunks, and the cheerful wards of a modern hospital, well illustrates the progress of sanitary science. The arrangements were evidently much admired at the time.

WILLIAM CHESELDEN . . . . . 69

SIR HANS SLOANE, BY THOMAS MURRAY . . . . . 71

LADY MARY WORTLEY MONTAGUE, BY JONATHAN RICHARDSON . . . 72

BISHOP PEARSON . . . . . 78

RICHARD BENTLEY, BY THOMAS HUDSON . . . . . 81

CHARLES BOYLE, EARL OF ORRERY . . . . . 88

The classical scholar, or rather dilettante, and the exciting cause of Bentley's "Phalaris."

FRONTISPIECE TO SWIFT'S "BATTLE OF THE BOOKS" . . . . . 85

The battle is between the "Ancients" and "Moderns" in literature.

"HORACE AT CAMBRIDGE": A CARICATURE OF BENTLEY . . . . . 87

From a collection of "Miscellanies," by W. King, LL.D., which, but for their coarseness, resemble the satires written by junior members of the universities at present. This example is entitled "Some Account of Horace, his behaviour during his stay at Trinity College, Cambridge, with an Ode to entreat his departure thence." Bentley had published an edition of Horace, and the pamphlet identifies him with that author. It quotes Horace's prediction that he would come to Britain (*Odes*, Bk. III., 4), and his description of himself (Englished as "plump and fine, and one of Epicurus' swine"), and attacks Bentley for his extravagance at the expense of the college. He is charged with spending on fuel in one year £110 3s. 9d., which is more than any nobleman in England, certainly any archbishop, spent in that time; with gluttony and indulgence in wine, and with exceeding his allowance in one year by £454 6s. 1d. Amongst other charges it is noted that "he never failed to be the most zealous attendant at a gawdy or a bonfire." (A "gawdy" [*gaudium*] is a college dinner, but modern heads of colleges attend bonfires, if ever, solely for disciplinary purposes.) The supposed medal charges him with getting fat at the expense of the college store-cupboard (promptuarium).

THOMAS TYRWHITT . . . . . 91

TITLE-PAGE OF BRIAN WALTON'S POLYGLOT BIBLE, BY W. HOLLAR . 93

AN EIGHTEENTH CENTURY VIEW OF OLD ENGLAND . . . . . 95

"Aella" may be the warrior mentioned in the Old English Chronicle as one of the besiegers of Anderida (Pevensey) in 491. Deira, it may be remembered, was the province which occasioned Pope Gregory's remark when he saw the British captives exposed for sale as slaves at Rome, that they were saved "from the wrath" (*de ira*) of God. The two towns shown, "Ellanstowe" (Aella's place) and "Foxesden" are probably as imaginary as their architecture. Cf. the description of the Old English warriors, Vol. I., p. 204.

	PAGE
ALEXANDER POPE WITH MARTHA BLOUNT, BY CHARLES JERVAS . . . . .	97
It is probably his friend Martha Blount who is represented, though it has been conjectured to be his sister Mrs. Rackett.	
FRONTISPIECE TO POPE'S "DUNCIAD," 1728 . . . . .	101
To avoid an action for libel, the book was published anonymously, and stated to be a reprint from a (fictitious) Dublin edition. Pope did not acknowledge it till 1735.	
JOHN GAY, BY SIR GODFREY KNELLER . . . . .	104
ISAAC WATTS . . . . .	105
The "Above Bar Congregational Church" is the successor of the Independent Chapel in which Watts's earliest hymns were first sung in 1695 and 1696. He was born and partly educated at Southampton, and his father was a deacon of the chapel.	
JAMES THOMSON, BY WILLIAM AIKMAN . . . . .	107
HENRY ST. JOHN, VISCOUNT BOLINGBROKE, BY H. RIGAUD . . . . .	109
DANIEL DEFOE, BY VAN DER GUCHT . . . . .	111
From his "Jure Divino" (a poem), ed. 1710.	
SKETCH FOR THE PAINTED CEILING AT GREENWICH, BY SIR JAMES THORNHILL . . . . .	116
THE OLD EAST INDIA WHARF, BY PETER MONAMY . . . . .	118
<i>to face</i>	
GEORGE FREDERICK HANDEL, BY ROUBILLAC (bust) . . . . .	119
GEORGE FREDERICK HANDEL, BY SIR JAMES THORNHILL . . . . .	121
SENESEINO . . . . .	123
Representing the opera of <i>Julius Cæsar</i> : Senesino is Mark Antony, Guzzoni Cleopatra, and Berenstat Julius Cæsar. This identification fixes the date at 1725. It has been conjectured, however, that Farinelli, who is known to have been very heavy and clumsy in his movements, may be Julius Cæsar, and, if so, the print must be subsequent to 1734, the date of his arrival in England. But the figure was apparently identified with Berenstat soon after the publication of the print. It has also been conjectured that the opera was Handel's <i>Ptolemy</i> , in which the characters were Ptolemy, Cleopatra, and Julius Cæsar. Cf. <i>Catalogue of Satirical Prints in the British Museum</i> , Vol. III., No. 1768.	
HANDEL'S HARPSICORD . . . . .	125
MONUMENT TO HANDEL, WESTMINSTER ABBEY . . . . .	129
DUNSTON PILLAR, NEAR LINCOLN . . . . .	132
The only land lighthouse ever built. Erected and dedicated to the public use by Mr. F. Dashwood, a local landowner, in 1751. The lantern on top was replaced by a statue of George III. at his jubilee in 1810.	
HARVESTERS' LEATHER BOTTLE, 1757.—SPINNING WHEEL . . . . .	133
PLAN OF PART OF AN OPEN FIELD . . . . .	135
Dean Manor, Oxfordshire; part of the estates of Oriel College, Oxford. Reproduced, with others, by the late J. L. G. Mowat, <i>Sixteen Old Maps of Properties in Oxfordshire, etc.</i> , 1888. Compare the plan and view referred to in the text.	

## LAND SURVEYING.

The portrait of the draughtsman of one of the plans (that of Chalford) of an estate belonging to Oriel College, which, with the plan shown above and others, was reproduced by the late J. L. G. Mowat, in 1887.

## WEIGHING MACHINE, SOHAM, CAMBRIDGESHIRE . . . . . 139

An iron or steel lever, the "steelyard," was hung from a strong bracket projecting from the wall of the weigh-house, or in some cases from a horizontal pole resting on two uprights like a football goal. The short arm of the lever, about a foot long, was provided with a hook and chains, from which was hung the object to be weighed. The longer arm, about 10 feet in length, moved in a slot or loophole in the wall of the weigh-house. It was graduated and numbered like a rule, and provided with a sliding weight. This was moved till it balanced the object at the other end, and its position then gave the weight of the object. The "engine," as it was called, was in fact similar to the steelyards still used in butchers' shops. For the illustration and note the Editor is indebted to Mr. T. D. Atkinson. A similar machine exists at Woodbridge, Suffolk.

## JETHRO TULL . . . . . 141

Tull, who was a commoner of St. John's College, Oxford, and a member of Gray's Inn, settled on Howberry Farm, Crowmarsh, after his marriage in 1699, having previously travelled extensively on the Continent. He invented the drill for mechanical sowing about 1701, finding that hand-sowing was not accurate enough for the success of sainfoin. He went abroad again, partly for his health, in 1711-1714, in France and Italy, and spent the remaining twenty-six years of his life at the subject of the next illustration.

## PROSPEROUS FARM, NEAR SHALBOURN, BERKSHIRE. . . . . 142

The house appears to have been rebuilt since Tull's time; when Arthur Young visited it in 1794, it was covered with home-made glazed tiles; the old granary and stable were standing in 1840. See Lord Cathcart's Memoir in the *Journal of the Royal Agricultural Society*, 1891.

## CHARLES, SECOND VISCOUNT TOWNSHEND . . . . . 143

## RAINHAM HALL, NORFOLK . . . . . 145

Built from a design by Inigo Jones about 1630; additions were made to it by the second Lord Townshend.

A SILK SPINNING MILL (*see text*) . . . . . 147

## SHEFFIELD IN 1742 . . . . . 151

## GLASSMAKING IN 1747. . . . . 154

## HENRY WOODWARD AND KITTY CLIVE IN CHELSEA PORCELAIN . . . 155

In character, as the "Fine Lady" and "Fine Gentleman" in Garrick's play of *Letho*, 1741. They were a celebrated actor and actress. Similar statuettes of actors in Bow and Chelsea porcelain are not uncommon, and, according to the catalogue of the Schreiber collection, the two kinds are not easily distinguished.

## THE SOUTH SEA BUBBLE, BY WILLIAM HOGARTH . . . . . 157

The base is shown of the Monument, near London Bridge; the foxes represent directors of the South Sea Company. Trade lies dead; the Devil cuts pieces from a figure of Fortune, and distributes them

among the crowd. Self-interest breaks the limbs of Honesty; Honour is in the pillory; in the middle, Alexander Pope is shown with his hands in the pocket of a fat man, who is perhaps Gay, with his Fables, as a horn-book, hanging at his waist. Pope ventured some of his money in the scheme; Gay did so, likewise, and lost it; and the suggestion may be that Pope tempted Gay to venture, or even sold his own stock to him. The identification of Pope and Gay in this picture is due to Nicholls, *Literary Anecdotes*, 1785.

EXCISE AND SERVITUDE, 1733 . . . . . 163

Walpole is seated on a hog'shead of tobacco, drawn by a unicorn, with his tail cut and his horn broken, and by a lion yoked and wearing wooden shoes, the customary symbol of French despotism. Westminster Hall and St. James's Palace, and the standing army are likewise shown. Walpole's Excise Bill was violently opposed, both inside and outside Parliament, and though the second reading was carried by 265 votes to 204, it was dropped shortly afterwards.

THE DEFEAT OF THE EXCISE BILL, 1733 . . . . . 165

The print is entitled "The Noble Stand, or the Glorious 204." Micaiah Perry and Sir John Barnard, whose names appear prominently at the top of the maypole, were members for the City of London, and leading opponents of the Bill. The merchant and ship represent Trade. Liberty rests, cap on spear, while Justice tramples on Oppression.

THE LOTTERY, BY WILLIAM HOGARTH . . . . . 167

National Credit stands at the top of the pedestal, holding the Church; below, Apollo and Justice, the former directing the attention of Britannia to a picture on the wall, representing the earth enriched by showers drawn from itself—an emblem of the relations of the lottery and the nation. Wantonness, in a dress half male, half female, is drawing the numbers. Fortune, the blanks and prizes; below, Suspense, pushed to right by Hope and Fear; Good Luck, tempted by Folly and Pleasure, and exhorted by Fame to raise the depressed arts, represented by a philosopher engaged with a geometrical diagram; Industry, with a hive, a spinning-wheel, and a miner's pick; Misfortune, fainting at having drawn a blank; Fraud, in the opening at the front of the pedestal, tempting Despair; Avarice, hugging his money; Sloth, with his head in the curtain.

THE BANK OF ENGLAND, BUILT IN 1733 . . . . . 169

Pennant, writing in 1793, says "Of late years two wings of uncommon elegance, designed by Sir Robert Taylor, have been added, at the expense of a few houses, and of the Church of St. Christopher le Stocks . . . Much of my kindred dust was violated." The architect of the building here shown was George Sampson.

SCREENING THE SOUTH SEA DIRECTORS . . . . . 171

The pier-glass shows the figures behind the screen. The holder of the rod is probably Craggs or Aislachie, the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The ladies may be the Duchess of Kendal, Countess Platen, and other mistresses of the king. The designs on the screen are: 1, the Columna Mœnia in the Roman Forum, where fraudulent bankrupts were punished; 2, Friar Bacon's brazen head (satirising the effrontery of the financiers); 3, "Venal Rome," a slave taking a bribe; 4, Britain expiating a crime; 5, the Tarpeian Rock at Rome, whence traitors were hurled headlong; 6, the murder of the De Witts in 1672; 7, the gallows on Tower Hill; 8, London, in female form, destroyed. The map, showing Antwerp, is an allusion to the

imprisonment of Knight, the South Sea Company's cashier, in the fortress in that city.

LIVERPOOL IN 1728, BY S. AND N. BUCK . . . . .	173
QUAY ON THE IRWELL AT MANCHESTER . . . . .	175
RACING AT NEWMARKET, ABOUT 1730, AFTER PIETER TILLEMANS . . . . .	177
Tillemans, a Dutch engraver, came to England in 1708, and seems to have lived there till his death in 1734.	
GIN LANE, BY WILLIAM HOGARTH, 1751 . . . . .	180
A law restricting the sale of "Geneva" was passed in 1736, but subsequently repealed, and the resultant drunkenness was only partially checked by the Gin Act of 1751. Hogarth made two companion drawings, "Beer Street" and "Gin Lane," intended to recommend beer as against gin. In "Beer Street," the only house whose inhabitants are not prosperous is that of the pawnbroker, and he is in fear of the bailiffs; and "Gin Lane," here shown, depicts a squalid street in St. Giles's (the spire of the church of St. George's, Bloomsbury, is seen in the background) with an itinerant gin-seller, one of a class common at this period, lying drunk in the street.	
QUEEN CAROLINE OF ANSPACH, BY ENOCH SEEMAN . . . . .	183
The consort of George II.	
HORATIO WALPOLE, FOURTH EARL OF ORFORD, BY JOHN ECCARDT . . . . .	185
THE REVIEW: A SATIRE ON HOOP SKIRTS . . . . .	187
RANELAGH IN 1752, AFTER CANALETTI . . . . .	189
THE STAGE IN 1721 . . . . .	190
The print represents "An Epilogue spoken to a play called the Alchymist" (by Ben Jonson), performed at Drury Lane, October 27, 1721, but the figures have no reference to the play. Verses are printed below, to the effect that there are worse rascals at this period than in Ben Jonson's time, and reference is made to the South Sea Bubble and Law's Mississippi scheme.	
A RAFFLE . . . . .	191
From the back of a playing card preserved in the British Museum.	
A couplet appended runs— "At Epsom oft these rafflings I have seen, But assignation's what they chiefly mean."	
RELICS OF HIGHWAYMEN, YORK MUSEUM . . . . .	193
1, The leg-bar of Nevison, a famous highwayman; 3, leg-bar and, 4, girdle of the celebrated Dick Turpin; 2, fetters found in 1773 in the castle moat on the legs of a skeleton, supposed to be that of one William Thompson, a prisoner who had been missing for twenty years.	
A COFFEE HOUSE IN 1733 . . . . .	196
A WINE PARTY . . . . .	197
From an illustrated song book, "The Musical Entertainer," of about 1733.	
SCARBOROUGH SANDS IN 1735 . . . . .	199
The mineral spring which gave Scarborough its importance as health resort was discovered by a local lady, Mrs. Farrow, in 1620,	



and "became the usual physic of the inhabitants." In 1696 the waters were collected in a cistern. The Spa-house was destroyed by a landslip in 1737, but the spring was recovered. Allen, *History of the County of York*, 1831, III., 455.

MRS. DELANY, BY JOHN OPIE . . . . . 201

POPE GREGORY AND ELIZABETH ELSTOB . . . . . 203

Of special interest as an attempt to imitate a medieval illuminated MS. in a period dominated by classical art. Elizabeth Elstob translated the Anglo-Saxon homily of Ælfric on the Birthday of St. Gregory, the pope who initiated Augustine's mission for the conversion of England; the first page is here shown. The title-page has already been reproduced at p. 95.

TOY-SELLER (*cf.* Vol. IV., p. xlvii) . . . . . 204

ETON COLLEGE, BY CANALETTI . . . . . 205

THE FUNERAL TICKET, BY WILLIAM HOGARTH . . . . . 207

Date about 1730. The inscription reads: "You are desired to accompany the Corps (*sic*) of — from h— late Dwelling in — to — on — next at — of the Clock in the Evening." It is an early and rare work of Hogarth, and exhibits much humour, especially in the faces and attitudes of the parson and clerk.

PORTRAIT OF JAMES EDWARD, THE PRETENDER . . . . . 209

THE YORK WATER TOWER, FROM THE THAMES, BY SAMUEL SCOTT . . 210

This view is of somewhat later date than the period covered by this chapter. Scott, the best marine painter of his time, died in 1772. Old Westminster Bridge, which is seen in the distance, was erected in 1750, and demolished during the erection of the present bridge in 1855-62, the piers having settled owing to the increased current in the Thames caused by the removal of old London Bridge. The York Tower was erected in 1690-1695. Its business was ultimately ruined by the competition of other companies, and was sold to the New River Company in 1818.

THE PORTEOUS RIOT . . . . . 211

The engraving, unfortunately mutilated, represents the front of the Tolbooth, Edinburgh. The riot arose out of the execution of one Andrew Wilson for robbing an exciseman. The crowd at his hanging pelted the Edinburgh City Guard, whose commander, Captain Porteous, ordered them to fire. Six or seven persons were killed and about twenty wounded, and Porteous was tried for murder and sentenced to death. He was reprieved, and it was suspected that the Government would commute his sentence or allow him to escape. A gang of men therefore forced their way into the Tolbooth, took him out, and lynched him. The murderers were not discovered. The tract from which the illustration is taken was written in the course of a controversy which arose out of the passage of an Act denouncing Porteous's murderers, and threatening punishment to those who aided or harboured them, and requiring the clergy to read its substance from their pulpits, which half of them refused to do. *See Diet. Nat. Biog.*, art. "Porteous."

LAURISTON HOUSE, THE RESIDENCE OF JOHN LAW . . . . . 215

At Cramond, just outside Edinburgh. Built towards the end of the sixteenth century by Archibald Napier, younger brother of the inventor of logarithms; enlarged 1845.

ALLAN RAMSAY . . . . .	219
DONIBRISTLE HOUSE . . . . .	221

The first house was built towards the end of the sixteenth century. Three successive houses were burnt down, the last in 1858. The buildings shown contained its offices, etc., and were connected with it by an underground passage, which is probably the only part of the original structure still extant. The house is at the head of a bay running up from the Forth; the decorated wrought-iron staircase gives access to the beach. It is of Flemish (probably Bruges) work, and was presented by William III., when Prince of Orange, to Anne, wife of Charles, fifth Earl of Moray, whose monogram (A. C. M., *i.e.*, Anne, Countess of Moray) it bears. Millar, *Fife Pictorial and Historical*, 1895, II., 178.

MEDAL OF ROBERT FOULIS. . . . .	222
ONE OF WOOD'S HALFPENCE . . . . .	224

Wood's halfpence were coined from 1722 to 1724; 1 lb. of copper was to be made into coins of the value of 2s. 6d. They were of lighter weight, however, than that prescribed by the patent, and the outcry mentioned in the text compelled Wood to surrender his privilege. According to Mr. H. A. Grueber, however, "the workmanship of these coins is far superior to the English copper money, and they were made of the best metal that had yet been used for Ireland."

MEDAL ON SWIFT AND THE IRISH COINAGE . . . . .	227
THE RIGHT HON. HENRY PELHAM, BY W. HOARE, R.A. . . . .	229
ANTI-SEMITISM IN 1733 . . . . .	231

The Jews looking with delighted expectation upon London. The Duke of Newcastle and Mr. Henry Pelham, whom the opponents of the Bill (p. 231) declared to have been bribed to vote for it, are on a hill to the left receiving the Jews' salutations. The Bill was passed in June, 1753, by 96 votes to 55, but was repealed in December.

LORD NORTH. . . . .	233
The second Earl of Guilford, but best known from his earlier title.	
BUTE AND HIS ADMIRERS . . . . .	235

An etching by the Marquis Townshend. The jackboot, emblem of the Earl of Bute, bears the order of the Garter; the "blockhead" or wig-block, on the pole, is decorated with a Scotch bonnet and Stuart favour, in allusion to his supposed Jacobite sympathies. The "Briton," below the boot, is the paper in which Smollett supported his policy; the "Scotch Peace" (with France) is that negotiated by the Duke of Bedford and the Bute Ministry, 1762-3. "The Auditor" is Arthur Murphy, who wrote for a paper called by that name and supporting Bute. Hogarth ("Oh! Garth") is on the ground near the pole, with ass's ears, trying to prevent Wilkes from flogging the rest of Bute's admirers (Hogarth had satirised Bute's opponents). The Dukes of Cumberland and (probably) York are in the background, preparing to scourge Bute's supporters.

SATIRES ON THE WILKES CONTROVERSY . . . . .	237
---------------------------------------------	-----

Above (left), a caricature of Wilkes by Hogarth, representing him holding the staff of maintenance and a sham cap of liberty. The print is described in the *Catalogue of Satirical Prints in the British Museum* as a masterpiece of political satire, and it made "Wilkes" a

favourite character at masquerades. Hogarth is said to have sketched the face from life, while Wilkes was before the Court of Common Pleas, which declared the general warrant on which he had been arrested illegal. Right, a caricature of Hogarth in reply to that of Wilkes. Below, Daniel in the den of lions; in the centre a pedestal typifying the Excise Bill of the Bute Ministry; Bute is referred to in the Thistle and the golden image. Among the worshippers are Hogarth, with the print in which he satirised Bute's opponents; Murphy, of the *Auditor*; and Dr. Johnson promising to "teach his lordship to speak English." On the left, the British Lion, miserable and blindfolded; the king behind. Above are scenes connected with Wilkes's arrest. His brother and Earl Temple were refused leave to see him in the Tower.

AT HOME AND ABROAD . . . . . 239

Above, the kings of Spain, France, and Prussia, and the Empress-Queen partitioning the British dominions; below, the king weeping at the injury done by the Grafton Ministry to his honour and interest. References are made to Wilkes's expulsion from Parliament, the pardon of two men who had committed murder in an election riot at Brentford, the offer of troops to preserve the peace by Lord Weymouth, a confirmed gambler, the Duke of Grafton's divorce bill, and the despatch of troops to Boston in consequence of the riot in 1768. The five persons at the table are members of the Duke of Grafton's Ministry: the Duke of Bedford (on the spectator's left), Lord Mansfield, Lord Rochford, Lord Weymouth, and the Duke of Grafton.

LORD GEORGE GORDON AND THE PROTESTANT PETITION . . . . . 240

WILLIAM PITT, FIRST EARL OF CHATHAM, BY RICHARD BROMPTON . . . . . 241

SATIRE ON THE TREATY OF AIX-LA-CHAPELLE . . . . . 246

The ass in the lion's skin is England, the horse Hanover, to whose interests those of England are said in the pamphlet to be sacrificed by the peace; the otter is Holland, the tigress the Empress-Queen, the wolf Sardinia; Prussia is the monkey leading the muzzled bear, Russia; the fox is France, the leopard Spain, the badger Genoa, the crippled boar the Duke of Modena. The pamphlet satirises in dramatic form the aims and conduct of the Powers concerned. The goat is seemingly Portugal.

EUROPEAN AIMS IN 1748-9 . . . . . 247

The King of France is selling hostages: the Earl of Sussex and Lord Cathcart were actually sent to France as hostages for the restitution of Cape Breton. George II. sells turnips: Hanover was nicknamed the "Turnip Garden," and Hanoverian troops were employed in England, against the wish of the inhabitants. The Stadtholder of Holland sells gin; the King of Sweden and the King of Sardinia (probably) their soldiers' services; the King of Spain "Civel" (Seville) oranges for Gibraltar; while the Pretender, who it was proposed should settle at Fribourg after his expulsion from France by the treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle, has various unsaleable wares.

MAP OF THE BRITISH DOMINIONS IN NORTH AMERICA AFTER 1763 . . . . . to face 248

THE SACK OF ST. EUSTATIUS BY RODNEY AND VAUGHAN . . . . . 249

From a violently anti-English account, in Dutch—a conversation between a father and a son, entitled "*Englische Tieranei*." Rodney is described as Nero, Vaughan as Caligula. A motion for an inquiry into the conduct of Admiral Rodney and General Vaughan was brought forward in Parliament, but defeated by 163 votes to 84.

THE OPERATIONS AT DETTINGEN . . . . .	254
MEDAL CELEBRATING THE BATTLE OF FONTENOY . . . . .	255
<p>The letters F.M. below the bust of Louis XV. and M. on the reverse stand for the maker of the medal, François Marteau. On the reverse are Louis XV. and the Dauphin in a chariot, crowned by Victory. The inscriptions mean "The glory of the French Empire" and "The enemy defeated by the king himself at Fontenoy." The king and the Dauphin were in fact spectators of the battle.</p>	
PLAN OF CULLODEN . . . . .	257
<p>The Highland army, which had been besieging Stirling Castle, had retired to Inverness; the Duke of Cumberland was marching on them from Aberdeen. The Pretender had intended to attack him at Nairn, but failed to organise a nocturnal surprise in time, and fell back on Culloden Moor. The front line of his army was composed of the Athole brigade on the right, the post of honour, various other clans in the centre, and the Macdonalds on the left, who were dissatisfied with the preference shown to the Atholes; the second line, of the Gordons and the French and Irish troops; the third was a reserve. The Pretender himself was behind the centre of the front line. The Duke of Cumberland's army formed within a mile of the insurgents in three lines, its right being protected by a morass. The Highlanders were provoked into charging, both by the artillery fire mentioned in the text and by the movement shown in the plan to take them in their right flank: they charged furiously, and their right broke the first English line, but not the second. The effect of the charge was marred by the slackness of the Macdonalds in advancing. The Highlanders broke and were pursued almost to Inverness. Croome, <i>Ordnance Gazetteer of Scotland</i>, s.v. "Culloden."</p>	
LOUISBOURG, CAPE BRETON, FROM A WATERCOLOUR SKETCH . . . . .	259
<p>The view, apparently drawn about 1758, shows the south-western half of the harbour, with Goat Island, from the sea. It covers a space of nearly two miles.</p>	
PLAN OF FORT DUQUESNE (NOW PITTSBURG), 1754 . . . . .	264
GENERAL VIEW OF QUEBEC, 1761 (drawn by R. Short). . . . .	267
MILITARY CLOAK OF GENERAL WOLFE (TOWER OF LONDON) . . . . .	268
THE RECRUITING SERGEANT . . . . .	269
THE OPERATIONS ON LONG ISLAND, 1777 . . . . .	272
THE OPERATIONS AT SARATOGA . . . . .	275
FRENCH MEDAL COMMEMORATING THE ENGLISH FAILURE AT TOULON . . . . .	278
<p>February 11-22, 1744. A French and Spanish fleet sailed out of Toulon to attack the English, but though put to flight was not properly pursued on account of a quarrel between the British commanders, Matthews and Lestock. Both were impeached, and the latter dismissed the service; the man hanging is probably meant to signify what fate they deserved. The letters may refer to some printed account of the incident issued with the medal and now lost.</p>	
REAR-ADMIRAL THE HON. JOHN BYNG, BY THOMAS HUDSON . . . . .	279
LIGHTHOUSE CANDLES (found at Trinity House among old stores) . . . . .	282
MODEL OF SMEATON'S EDDYSTONE LIGHTHOUSE . . . . .	283

	PAGE
THE <i>HERMIONE</i> . . . . .	285
TOBIAS GEORGE SMOLLETT, M D., R.N. . . . .	287
REMAINS OF THE <i>ROYAL GEORGE</i> . . . . .	289
The story of how the vessel sank during repairs, "with twice five hundred men," is well known from Cowper's poem.	
SAMUEL, FIRST VISCOUNT HOOD, BY L. F. ABBOTT . . . . .	291
ADMIRAL ANSON . . . . .	293
HALF-CROWN MINTED FROM CAPTURED SPANISH SILVER . . . . .	295
With LIMA; from the galleon bringing silver from Peru.	
COMMODORE BYRON AND THE PATAGONIANS . . . . .	297
OTAHEITE SURRENDERED TO CAPTAIN WALLIS . . . . .	299
These scenes are probably drawn by artists in England from rough sketches made on the spot. The savages are greatly idealised, as was the custom in the literature of the eighteenth century.	
A NATIVE DANCE AT OTAHEITE, AFTER J. B. CIPRIANI . . . . .	300
CAPTAIN JAMES COOK, F.R.S. . . . .	301
A NEW ZEALANDER . . . . .	304
OMAI, BY SIR JOSHUA REYNOLDS, P.R.A. . . . .	305
INTERIOR OF AN INDIAN DWELLING, NOOTKA SOUND . . . . .	306
A NONCONFORMIST MINISTER . . . . .	308
A QUAKER MEETING . . . . .	309
THE QUAKERESS . . . . .	310
THE QUAKER . . . . .	311
PHILIP DODDRIDGE . . . . .	316
JOHN WESLEY, BY NATHANIEL HONE, R.A. . . . .	319
At the age of 63; painted in 1766.	
DAVID HUME . . . . .	323
Engraved by Martin from a portrait by Allan Ramsay.	
ADAM SMITH . . . . .	325
From a portrait medallion by Tassie.	
DAVID HARTLEY . . . . .	326
From the portrait in his "Observations on Man," ed. 1791.	
RICHARD PRICE, BY BENJAMIN WEST . . . . .	327
A CHEMICAL LABORATORY IN 1747 . . . . .	329

In the corner, at the spectator's extreme right, a subliming furnace; near it two receivers, a long-necked circulatory vessel or "pelican," two retorts, a stand or "roundle" for glasses, and a shovel, scraper and broom. Against the wall the chemist at work, distilling a liquor which is passed, in a pipe, through a barrel of water to cool and condense it; next, on the right, a "vaporous bath," with furnace and

receiver; apparatus for distilling aqua vitæ, and "a matrass of ren-counter"—two globes joined by long tubes—used in distilling and digesting substances. In the distance an apothecary's shop.

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN, BY D. MARTIN . . . . .	333
SAMUEL JOHNSON (two portraits), BY SIR JOSHUA REYNOLDS . . . . .	337
JOHNSON'S HOUSE, BOLT COURT. FLEET STREET . . . . .	340
Johnson lived here from 1776 till 1784. and wrote his "Lives of the Poets" in the house. Here, also, he maintained the strange body of fretful pensioners of whom a little is heard in Boswell's <i>Life</i> . The house was still standing in 1872, but is now removed.	
JAMES BOSWELL, BY SIR JOSHUA REYNOLDS . . . . .	341
SAMUEL RICHARDSON . . . . .	343
At the age of 61; painted in 1750 by Joseph Highmore.	
HENRY FIELDING, FROM A ROUGH SKETCH BY HOGARTH . . . . .	345
LAURENCE STERNE, BY GAINSBOROUGH . . . . .	347
JAMES MACPHERSON (the Editor of "Ossian") by George Romney . . . . .	349
THOMAS GRAY, FROM A DRAWING BY BENJAMIN WILSON . . . . .	351
STOKE POGES CHURCHYARD, BUCKS . . . . .	352
The scene of Gray's "Elegy in a Country Churchyard." The church, which is about two-and-a-half miles north of Slough, is partly Norman and Early English, and contains the (reputed) tombs of Sir John de Molyns, treasurer to Edward III., and Sir William de Molyns, who fell at the siege of Orleans in 1429. as well as of several descendants of Sir William Penn. Gray himself, and his mother and aunt, are buried in the churchyard under a plain flat stone, on which is an epitaph on the two latter written by himself. He died July 30, 1771.	
OLIVER GOLDSMITH, BY SIR JOSHUA REYNOLDS . . . . .	353
THE RIGHT HON. RICHARD BRINSLEY SHERIDAN, BY JOHN RUSSELL. R.A. . . . .	355
Drawn in crayons in 1788, when the subject was 33.	
PHILIP DORMER STANHOPE, FOURTH EARL OF CHESTERFIELD, BY THOMAS HUDSON . . . . .	359
MEMBERS OF THE SOCIETY OF DILETTANTI, BY SIR JOSHUA REYNOLDS . . . . .	361

The society was founded in 1734 (or more probably in 1732), partly for social intercourse and partly to promote "the cause of virtue," by some gentlemen who had travelled in Italy. They sent out various expeditions to study the antiquities of Greece (Dr. Chandler, in 1764, to the neighbourhood of Smyrna; Mr. James Stuart, in 1751, to Athens; Sir William Gell, in 1814, to examine the principles of Ionian architecture; Mr. F. C. Penrose, in 1846, to study Athenian architecture), all of which resulted in important books. They did service in other ways to classical archaeology, and they promoted the formation of a Royal Academy, and even of a permanent opera, though the latter scheme (about 1743) soon broke down. The rule was that every member should present his portrait to the society. Reynolds held the office of painter to the society from 1769 to his death in 1792. Some of the members preferred to be painted in groups. The group here shown represents the second Lord Mulgrave, the first Lord Dundas, the last Earl of Seaforth, the Hon. C. F. Greville, the

fifth Duke of Leeds, Charles Crowle, Esq., and Sir Joseph Banks, Bart., K.B., President of the Royal Society. That at page 466 represents Sir Watkin W. Wynn, Bart., Sir John Taylor, Bart., Mr. Stephen Payne Gallwey, Sir William Hamilton, K.B., Mr. Richard Thompson, Mr. Spencer Stanhope, and Mr. Smyth of Heath. Both these paintings soon decayed, and were restored in 1811. They were originally painted in 1779. (*Historical Notices of the Society of Dilettanti*, printed for private circulation, London, 1855.)

THE RAKE'S PROGRESS, BY WILLIAM HOGARTH . . . . . to face 362

St. James' Street, with St. James's Palace at bottom; a royal levee in progress, to which the hero is proceeding when stopped by bailiffs. He is, however, saved by the woman he has wronged, who happens to be selling laces in the street, and offers her purse to the bailiffs. The Welshman looking on, by the leak in his hat, fixes the date as St. David's Day, which was Queen Caroline's birthday—hence, perhaps, the levee. The signboard on the left is said to be that of White's, the notorious gambling house.

THE HARLOT'S PROGRESS, BY WILLIAM HOGARTH . . . . . 365

This series, with the "Rake's Progress," "Industry and Idleness," and others, was described by Hogarth as the result of an attempt at "composing pictures on canvas, similar to representations on the stage"—i.e. a series of scenes connected by a story, and with some sort of moral. The original pictures, except this, were burnt at Fonthill in 1785. In this picture the heroine is represented as the mistress of a rich Jew, who has discovered her intrigue with another lover.

BATTLE OF THE PICTURES, 1745, BY WILLIAM HOGARTH (*see text*) . . 368

SIMON FRASER, LORD LOVAT, BY WILLIAM HOGARTH . . . . . 369

LANDSCAPE, WITH FIGURES, BY RICHARD WILSON . . . . . 371

OLD LONDON BRIDGE, 1745, BY SAMUEL SCOTT . . . . . 374

From the Surrey side; the houses seen were built after the Great Fire in 1666, and were removed between 1754 and 1761. The last remains of the bridge were removed in 1832.

SIR JOSHUA REYNOLDS: PORTRAIT BY HIMSELF . . . . . 376

Painted before his visit to Italy.

AUGUSTUS, VISCOUNT KEPPEL, BY SIR JOSHUA REYNOLDS . . . . . 377

The motive was supplied by the exertions of Keppel in saving the crew of his ship, the *Maidstone*, after she was wrecked in 1747, whence the background. The portrait made Reynolds's reputation, though the figure was taken from a statue, not from life (*Dict. of National Biography*).

THE STRAWBERRY GIRL, BY SIR JOSHUA REYNOLDS . . . . . 379

Exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1773; probably painted in 1772, and described by Mr. Spielmann as "a great success as a masterpiece of *espieglerie*." The child was Theophila Palmer, the artist's niece, who, according to a contemporary letter, "has lately been sitting for the Strawberry Girl, but thinks her uncle has made her far too much of a child for fourteen." The picture was bought at the Samuel Rogers sale in 1856 by the Marquis of Hertford for £2,205. (*Magazine of Art*, 1901, p. 163, "Gems of the Wallace Collection.")

MRS. SIDDONS AS THE TRAGIC MUSE, BY SIR J. REYNOLDS . . . . . 381

The great actress herself stated that her head was originally posed differently, but that she looked at a picture on the wall while Reynolds

was making his preparations, and that on seeing her changed attitude he preferred it. The date is 1784.

MARY, DUCHESS OF ANCASTER . . . . .	385
Engraved by J. McArdell after T. Hudson. Mr. F. Wedmore ( <i>Magazine of Art</i> , Vol. XXVI., p. 414) says that McArdell "carried mezzotint to a height it had not previously reached," and cites this picture as a proof.	
THOMAS GAINSBOROUGH, R.A., BY HIMSELF . . . . .	391
THE MARKET CART, BY THOMAS GAINSBOROUGH . . . . .	393
THE HON. MRS. GRAHAM, BY THOMAS GAINSBOROUGH . . . . .	395
GEORGE ROMNEY, BY HIMSELF, 1742 (AT THE AGE OF FORTY-EIGHT) . . . . .	397
RICHARD CUMBERLAND, BY GEORGE ROMNEY . . . . .	399
EXAMPLES OF PORTRAITURE, BY GEORGE ROMNEY . . . . .	401
JOHN FLAXMAN, R.A., MODELLING THE BUST OF HAYLEY, BY GEORGE ROMNEY . . . . .	403
ROBERT BAKEWELL . . . . .	405
ONE OF BAKEWELL'S SHEEP, BY SCHNEBBELIE . . . . .	407
The new Leicester or Dishley Breed was very hardy, and was considered to produce more wool and mutton per acre than any other breed. In 1790 130 Dishley ewes fetched an average of twenty-five guineas each, one lot attaining sixty-two guineas each. The drawing here reproduced was made in 1790, when the artist (an Alsatian) visited the farm with J. Nichols, who describes Bakewell's methods in his <i>History and Antiquities of Leicestershire</i> , Vol. II., pt. 2, p. 763—a huge folio.	
RIBBON WEAVER AT HIS LOOM . . . . .	409
The shuttle frame, held by the weaver, is shown by the artist apart from the warp which actually runs through it. The vertical threads, lifted by treadles and pulled down again by weights attached to their ends, take the place of the "heddles" in the simplest form of hand-loom, and enable the weaver to raise particular threads of the warp as the pattern may require, preparatory to passing the shuttle through. The shuttle works to and fro in the frame or "batton" held by the weaver, which in this description of loom also served the function of the usual reed, closing up the work. The finished ribbon should be shown going downwards from the warp to the roller, as well as upwards from the roller to the breast beam.	
JOHN KAY OF BURY (artist unknown) . . . . .	411
ARKWRIGHT'S SPINNING JENNY, 1769 ( <i>see text</i> , p. 414) . . . . .	413
A fuller account of these early spinning machines will be found in Baines's <i>History of the County Palatine of Lancaster</i> , Vol. II., p. 415 <i>seq.</i>	
SIR RICHARD ARKWRIGHT . . . . .	415
COAL WAGGON, 1764 . . . . .	417

Used to convey coal from the mines to the staithes on the Wear and Tyne; a horse could draw it forty miles a day. The hind wheels were of wood, the fore wheels of iron, and were specially made to run on the rails, a point seemingly misunderstood by the artist. The brake or "convoy" was used in going down inclines, the horse being



usually, but seemingly not always, taken off. It often failed to act, whence "hundreds of poor people and horses" had lost their lives.

EIGHTEENTH CENTURY RELICS FROM THE CARRON WORKS . . . 419

The cast-iron lintel, dated 1766, was used in the construction of the first blast furnace made at the Carron works; the steam cylinder, of which a portion is shown, dated 1760, was made at the works by James Watt.

COALBROOKDALE IN 1758 . . . . . 421

BROSELEY BRIDGE . . . . . 422

The "iron bridge" still exists, and has given its name to a market town adjacent. The arch is 100 ft. span and 40 ft. in height; the structure contains 378 tons of iron.

INTERIOR OF A SMELTING HOUSE AT BROSELEY, SHROPSHIRE . . . 423

MINERS' TOOLS FOUND IN AN OLD COAL MINE IN FIFESHIRE . . . 424

Found in June, 1901, in a disused pit at the Blair Burn, belonging to the Wemyss Coal Company, which had not been worked since the first quarter of the seventeenth century. The shovels were of wood, the picks of iron. The types, no doubt, lasted on for many years.

SAVERY'S ENGINE FOR RAISING WATER (*see* text, p. 426) . . . 425

The steam is admitted into the two receivers (in front of the larger boiler and behind the pipes) alternately, by moving the long projecting handle. The condensation in the vessel nearest the boiler is accelerated by a jet of water from the cock above it. A man, therefore, had to work the engine by constantly turning the two handles shown. The second boiler is for use during refilling of the first. The small cocks on top of the boilers communicate with gauge pipes, and when opened show whether the water is high enough to prevent injury to the bottom of the boiler, according as they blow off water or steam.

NEWCOMEN'S ENGINE (*see* text) . . . . . 427

POTTERY IN THE SCHREIBER COLLECTION. . . . . 429, *and to face* 430

Plymouth and Bristol porcelain, according to Lady Charlotte Schreiber (*Catalogue* of the Schreiber Collection), was "the only veritable porcelain made in England," except the productions of New Hall and possibly a few pieces made by Count Brancas Lauraguais. (For the relation of the Plymouth and Bristol works, *see* text, p. 420.) The exotic bird is one of a pair, painted in colours; height, 13 in. "Spring," 11 in. high, is one of a set of four statuettes representing the seasons. The subjects in the colour plate are a cook, an actor, a harlequin, an actress, and a negress, all of Bow china.

PLATE OF QUEEN'S (WEDGWOOD) WARE . . . . . 431

One of a set of twelve, with subjects from Æsop's fables; diameter, 10 in.

JASPER (WEDGWOOD) WARE . . . . . 432

"The material," according to Lady Charlotte Schreiber, "in which the chief triumphs of Wedgwood were wrought." Height, 5½ in.

GROUPS IN DERBY WARE—AT A COUNTRY FAIR: A PEEP-SHOW . . . 433

The subjects, according to Lady Charlotte Schreiber, are taken from Boucher's "Foire de Campagne" (a country fair). One of the groups

represents a girl looking into a peep-show; the other, a girl watching the turns of a fortune-telling machine. It is not certain whether these pieces were made at Derby or at Chelsea. Duesbury began to make China at Derby in 1755, and bought the Chelsea works in 1770.

A SPOON TRAY IN WORCESTER PORCELAIN . . . . . 434

Painted in colours, with gilding; the panels enclose exotic birds among foliage, and between them are smaller panels, showing insects. The original Worcester factory, started by Dr. Wall and Mr. W. Davis, was opened in 1751 and closed finally in 1847.

MUG, WITH PORTRAIT OF GENERAL WOLFE, IN SADLER'S WARE . . . 434

Sadler's ware, made at Liverpool, dates from about 1769 to about 1800, but there is no doubt that this piece is early. The height is 3 $\frac{3}{4}$  in.

THE DUKE OF BRIDGEWATER'S NAVIGATION ACROSS THE IRWELL . . . 437

ENTRANCE TO THE HARECASTLE TUNNEL, BRIDGEWATER CANAL . . . 439

GUINEAS OF GEORGE III. . . . . 441

The legend on the obverse of the guinea of 1761 in full would run, "Magnæ Britannię, Franciæ et Hiberniæ Rex, Fidei Defensor, Brunsvicensis et Lunenburgensis Dux, Sacri Romani Imperii Archithesaurarius et Elector," *i.e.* King of Great Britain, France and Ireland, Defender of the Faith, Duke of Brunswick and Luneburg, Arch-Treasurer and Elector of the Holy Roman Empire. The arms are—1, England and Scotland impaled; 2, France; 3, Ireland; 4, the Electorate of Hanover. In the spade guinea the king's face is older, and the shield is shaped like the spade in a pack of cards.

AMERICA'S DISTRESS IN 1765 . . . . . 443

The print, published March 23, 1765, is entitled "The Deplorable State of America, or Scotch [Scotch] Government." Britannia offers Pandora's box, *i.e.* the Stamp Act, to America; Minerva advises its rejection: Liberty is on the ground, prostrate, annoyed by the emblems of Bute (the thistle) and of treachery. Mercury (Trade) leaves reluctantly for America; the King of France offers a bribe that the policy of the Government may be continued. The boot is, of course, the emblem of Lord Bute; the broom at the masthead of one of the ships in the distance is a sign that it is for sale. The "Stamp men" are excisemen, represented as constrained to their calling by hunger.

THE REPEAL OF THE STAMP ACT . . . . . 445

The print, published 1766, is entitled "The Repeal, or the funeral of Miss Ame-Stamp." The ships bear the names of three ministers (Lord Rockingham, the Duke of Grafton, and Mr. Seymour Conway) who strongly supported the repeal. On the tomb is an inscription to the memory of hearth-money, ship-money, the Excise Bill, the Jew Bill, and General Warrants (*cf.* Vol. III., p. 715; Vol. IV., p. 18; Vol. V., pp. 9, 234). The skulls are those of the Old and Young Pretender. The thistle and rose (the latter the Stuart emblem) are insulting references to Bute. The numbers on the lighters and on the escutcheons refer to the votes in the two Houses in important divisions on the question of Repeal. The funeral procession is led by Dr. Scott, who wrote letters attacking Lord Bute, and signed "Anti-Sejanus" in the *Public Advertiser* of 1765; the coffin is carried by George Grenville, who introduced the Act; Lord Bute follows. Then the Duke of Bedford and Lord Temple, Lord Halifax and the Earl of Sandwich, and the two Bishops. The Duke of Bedford had been pelted by riotous weavers the year before (*see post*, note on illustration to p. 463).

MACARONI MAKING AS AT BOSTON IN 1774 . . . . .	PAGE 447
An allusion to the forcing of duty-paid tea on the colonists.	
CARPENTERS' HALL, PHILADELPHIA . . . . .	449
Here the first American Congress met.	
THE BALANCE OF CREDIT, 1772 . . . . .	453
Depicting North in an endeavour to raise the value of East India Stock, Britannia criticising, and the Tower in the distance, possibly as Lord North's proper destination. Two select committees were appointed in 1772 on Indian affairs. Allusions to the difficulties of the East India Company and the reduction of the naval forces are contained in the king's speech at the meeting of Parliament in November. The king, seen in the distance, begging, had been seriously pressed for money to pay his brother's debts.	
FRANCIS MASERES, CURSITOR BARON OF THE EXCHEQUER . . . . .	457
He was the originator, in 1772, of a scheme for life annuities for the poor. The compulsory insurance scheme referred to in the text was suggested by the Rev. John Acland, Vicar of Broadclyst, Devon. ( <i>Dictionary of National Biography</i> .)	
THE TAILORS' STRIKE, 1763 . . . . .	461
The workmen are in prison, but feasting on the gifts brought by their friends. A companion print shows the masters considering an application from the men for an increase of wages, and commenting on it with indignation.	
THE WEAVERS IN AN UPROAR (May, 1765) . . . . .	463
In 1763 the weavers were in conflict with the master manufacturers, and in 1764 they complained of the clandestine importation of French silks which interfered with the sale of English. A Bill to check the importation was rejected by the House of Lords in May, 1765, and the Duke of Bedford was pelted in his carriage in consequence of his speech against it, and was compelled to obtain troops to protect his house. The weavers also broke the windows of a shop in Ludgate Hill where French silks were shown.	
MEMBERS OF THE SOCIETY OF DILETTANTI. BY SIR J. REYNOLDS . . . . .	466
<i>See ante</i> , note on illustration to p. 361.	
THE COACH DRIVERS . . . . .	468
From "The Coach-Drivers," 1766, a political satire on Pitt and Bute. The old women inside represent the English people, the rumble contains other ministers, including the Duke of Bedford and George Grenville. Pitt is lashing the horses, Bute holding them in. Pitt was disliked by his colleagues for his warlike policy and extravagance, and was induced to resign in 1763. In 1766 he returned to power, not as Prime Minister in the Commons, but, in consequence of his health, as Lord Privy Seal, with the title of Lord Chatham, and the satire (of course, absurdly) ridicules his course as being determined by a mere desire for honours and rewards, and ends by expressing the hope that the king will hold the reins himself.	
SILVER CUP PRESENTED TO JOHN PALMER . . . . .	469
Presented to him by the Chamber of Commerce and the manufacturers of Glasgow, now the property of the Corporation of Bath, to whom it was given in 1875 by his granddaughter. He came of an old Bath family, and his father was proprietor of the Bath theatres.	

- TOKEN COMMEMORATING JOHN PALMER . . . . . 470  
 A tradesman's token, known as the "mail-coach halfpenny." For such tokens generally, *see post*, note on pp. 821, 828.
- ROSEWATER DISH OF 1750 . . . . . 472  
 Filled with scented water, it was brought in at the close of dinner to serve the same purpose for the whole party as the separate finger-glasses of modern times.
- THE ILLICIT TRAFFIC BETWEEN FRANCE AND ENGLAND . . . . 473
- THE OLD RED LION INN, RAKE . . . . . 473  
 No longer an inn. Galley and Chater (*see text*), while on their way to give evidence, were caught by the gang at Rowland's Castle, on the borders of Hants and Sussex, made drunk and put to bed, then kidnapped and, at the instigation of the wives of the smugglers, flogged continuously as they were taken on horseback to Rake, near Liss. They stayed at this inn, where Galley was found to be dead. He was buried in a sandpit near it. Shore, *Smuggling Days and Smuggling Ways*, p. 31, *seq.*
- THE LORD MAYOR AND ALDERMAN OLIVER IN THE TOWER . . . 475  
 Lord Mayor Brass Crosby and Alderman Richard Oliver sat with Wilkes when the printer Miller was discharged as described in the text, and were committed to the Tower by the House of Commons, of which they were members, for breach of privilege in refusing to recognise warrants of the House as valid within the city. The case is dealt with by Junius, Letter XLIV.
- DR. BRADLEY, ASTRONOMER-ROYAL . . . . . 477
- ECCENTRICITIES OF FASHION ABOUT 1772 . . . . . 481, 483  
 The "Macaronis" are said by Fairholt (*Costume in England*) to have been primarily a set of young men who had travelled in Italy and formed a club called the Macaroni Club, in contradistinction to the Beefsteak Club, in 1772. The name was then extended to dandies, or rather aesthetes, of both sexes. The towering hair, dressed in a club-knot behind, and (for men) the bow, frills, and strings at the knees, were their chief characteristics.
- THE CONTRAST: DRESSES OF 1745 AND 1772 . . . . . 482  
 The headdress seems to have been very small till about 1760, and to have begun to grow larger between that time and 1763. Of course, under these conditions the wearers could only "have their heads opened," as the phrase went, at long intervals, usually of several weeks, and the fashion was fatal to cleanliness. Fairholt, *Costume in England*.
- "BE NOT AMAZED, DEAR MOTHER! IT IS INDEED YOUR DAUGHTER ANNE" . . . . . to face 484  
 The country girl, who has risen in the world and entered fashionable life, comes back to her native village, attended by a black page. Stated to be "from an original drawing by Grimm;" one of the caricatures published by Carington Bowles.
- MRS. ELIZABETH MONTAGU (AFTER SIR J. REYNOLDS) . . . . 484
- MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY . . . . 485  
 "The English flute" was the name given to the eighteenth century form of the older recorder (*cf.* note to illustration, Vol. III., p. 207) which was being superseded by the German or transverse flute. The

wind instruments are those in general use in the town bands; the high-pitched trumpet or clarion of the seventeenth century having given place to the clarionet, an instrument sounded by the vibration of a single strip of reed or cane. In the hautboy, English horn ("cor anglais") and bassoon, the vibrating reed is double. The name "sackbut" disappears in the early part of this century, and the instrument is called the trombone. The serpent, frequently used in the church bands, was the predecessor of the ophicleide. The wing-shaped form of the spinet was adopted in England during the seventeenth century, and retained its popularity almost to the close of the eighteenth. The kit or pochette was used by dancing masters. (For the above note the Editor is indebted to the Rev. F. W. Galpin.)

PRINCE CHARLIE IN DISGUISE . . . . .	487
<p>After Culloden the Pretender fled to the Hebrides, and after five months' wanderings escaped to France. He was assisted to reach Skye from South Uist by Flora Macdonald, who passed him off, dressed in women's clothes, as Betty Burke, her Irish spinning maid. His size and his awkwardness in managing his skirts in crossing streams—at the first he held them much too high, at the second, having been cautioned, he did not hold them up at all—are specially noted. Details will be found in Boswell's <i>Tour to the Hebrides</i>.</p>	
LORD LOVAT'S EXECUTION: PORTION OF THE SCAFFOLD . . . . .	489
<p>Apparently the remains of one of the posts supporting the platform; found in excavating on Tower Hill, London, some years ago.</p>	
THE EARL OF CARLISLE AND HIS FAMILY IN THE PHOENIX PARK . . . . .	491
<p>Frederick, fifth Earl of Carlisle (1748-1825), in early life a man of pleasure and a gambler, afterwards had a distinguished political career. He was Commissioner to arrange terms of peace with the American colonies in 1778, Lord Lieutenant of Ireland from October, 1780, to March, 1782, and held other offices. He was Lord Byron's guardian, and the second edition of the poet's early work, "Hours of Idleness," was dedicated to him.</p>	
HENRY FLOOD . . . . .	493
A FIGHTING PRELATE . . . . .	494
<p>A caricature of the Earl of Bristol, Lord Bishop of Derry, who was an enthusiastic supporter of the Irish volunteer movement.</p>	

## CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS VOLUME.

---

- BATESON, Miss MARY, Associate and Lecturer of Newnham College. Cambridge ; Editor of *Records of the Borough of Leicester*; *Catalogue of the Library of Syon Monastery*, etc. ; Author of *Mediæval England* (Story of the Nations Series).
- BEAZLEY, C. RAYMOND, M.A., F.R.G.S., Fellow of Merton College, and Lecturer in the History of Geography, Oxford ; Author of *The Dawn of Modern Geography*; *Henry the Navigator*; *John and Sebastian Cabot*. Editor of John de Plano Carpini's *Historia Mongalorum*, William de Rubruquis' *Itinerarium*; Azurara's *Chronica de Guiné*.
- BROWN, Rev. JOHN, D.D. ; Author of *John Bunyan: His Life, Times, and Work*; *The Pilgrim Fathers of New England*; *Apostolical Succession in the Light of History and Fact*; and of *The Yale Lecture on Puritan Preaching in England*.
- CLOWES, Sir WILLIAM LAIRD, Fellow of King's College, London ; Hon. Member R.U.S. Inst. ; Gold Medallist, U.S. Naval Institute ; Associate of the Institute of Naval Architects ; Author of *The Royal Navy: A History to the Death of Queen Victoria*.
- COLVILLE, JAMES, M.A., D.Sc. (Edin.), sometime Examiner in History at Glasgow University ; Editor of Spalding's *English Literature* and Shakespeare's *Coriolanus* (for Schools) ; Author of *Byways of History* ; Editor of *Letters of John Cockburn of Ormistoun* (Scottish History Society, Vol. XIV.).
- CROWEST, FREDERICK J., Author of *The Story of British Music*; *The Great Tone Poets*; *Phases of Musical England*, etc.
- GRETTON, Major G. LE M., 3rd Battalion Leicestershire Regiment ; sometime Examiner at the University of Adelaide.
- GRIFFITHS, Major ARTHUR, late 63rd Regt. ; H.M. Inspector of Prisons ; John Howard Gold Medallist ; Author of *Chronicles of Newgate*; *Memorials of Millbank*; *Secrets of the Prison House*, etc.
- HASSALL, ARTHUR, Student and Tutor of Christ Church, Oxford, and sometime Examiner in the School of Modern History ; Author of *Bolingbroke*; *Louis XIV.*; *A Handbook of European History*; *A Class Book of English History*; *The French People*; *Mazarin*; Editor of *Periods of European History*, and Author of Period VI. (*The Balance of Power*); Joint Editor of and Contributor to *Constitutional Essays*; Editor of the third edition of Dyer's *Modern Europe*, and of *The Student's France*; collector and Editor of Bishop Stubbs's Historical Introductions to the Rolls Series.
- HUGHES, REGINALD, D.C.L.
- HUTTON, Rev. W. H., B.D., Fellow and Tutor of St. John's College, Oxford, and sometime Examiner in the Honour School of Modern History ; Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Ely ; Author of *William Laud*; *The Marquis Wellesley*; *Sir Thomas More*; *The Church of the VI. Century*; *A Short*

*History of the Church in Great Britain; The Influence of Christianity on National Character, illustrated by the Lives and Legends of the English Saints* (Bampton Lectures, 1902), etc.

JOYCE, P. W., LL.D., one of the Commissioners for the Publication of the Ancient Laws of Ireland; Author of *A Short History of Ireland: The Origin and History of Irish Names of Places; Old Celtic Romances; Ancient Irish Music; A Child's History of Ancient Ireland; A Social History of Ancient Ireland*.

MONTAGUE, F. C., M.A., late Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford, and Professor of History at University College, London; Author of *The Limits of Individual Liberty; Elements of English Constitutional History*; Editor of *Macaulay's Essays*.

POWER, D'ARCY, F.S.A., M.A., M.B. (Oxon.), F.R.C.S. (Eng.); Surgeon to St. Bartholomew's Hospital, and to the Victoria Hospital for Children, Chelsea; Editor of South's *Memorials of the Craft of Surgery*; Contributor to the *Dictionary of National Biography*.

PROTHERO, R. E., M.A., M.V.O., sometime Fellow of All Souls' College, Oxford; formerly Editor of the *Quarterly Review*; Author of *Pioneers and Progress of English Farming; The Life of Dean Stanley; The Psalms in Human Life*; Editor of *Dean Stanley's Letters and Verses, The Letters of Edward Gibbon, The Letters of Lord Byron*, etc.

SAINTSBURY, GEORGE, M.A., Professor of Rhetoric and English Literature in the University of Edinburgh; Author of *A Short History of French Literature; Histories of Elizabethan and Nineteenth Century Literature; A Short History of English Literature; A History of Criticism*, etc.

SANDYS, JOHN EDWIN, Litt.D., Fellow, Lecturer (and late Tutor) of St. John's College, and Public Orator in the University of Cambridge; Hon. Litt.D., Dublin; Editor of the *Orator of Cicero, the Bacchae of Euripides, the Panegyrics of Isocrates, the Olynthiics, Philippics, Leptines, and Private Speeches of Demosthenes, and Aristotle's Constitution of Athens*; Author of *A History of Classical Scholarship*.

SMITH, A. L., M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Balliol College, Oxford.

SYMES, Professor J. E., M.A., Principal of University College, Nottingham; Author of *A Short Text Book of Political Economy; The French Revolution; The Prelude to Modern History*, etc.

TRAILL, H. D. (Editor), sometime Fellow of St. John's College, Oxford; Author of *The Life of Sir John Franklin; Sterne; Coleridge* ("English Men of Letters" Series); *William III.* ("Twelve English Statesmen"); *The New Lucian*, etc.

WARNER, G. TOWNSEND, M.A., late Fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge, and sometime Examiner in the Historical Tripos at Cambridge; Author of *Landmarks of English Industrial History*.

WHITTAKER, T., B.A., Author of *The Neo-Platonists; a Study in the History of Hellenism*; Joint Editor of Croom Robertson's *Remains*; sometime Assistant Editor of *Mind*.

## PREFATORY NOTE.



THE Georgian Era is somewhat lacking in those conventionally picturesque elements that adorn the earlier periods of English history. We are apt to think of its least attractive features first. It is an age—for the majority of Englishmen—of coarse material welfare, of somewhat gross ideals, of a religious life which for the greater part of society is lowered in tone as compared with that of the preceding century, and which, when it revives, takes shapes that appeal to the mind rather than to the eye of the artist. Literature, in spite of its diversity and its new developments in history, in poetry, and in fiction, is, during the greater part of the period, somewhat restricted by arbitrary canons; some of it, and still more some of the art which most appealed to the popular taste, is nauseating and, indeed, amazing in its grossness. Science becomes positive, and the foundations are laid of modern physics and chemistry, but its interest is intellectual, not æsthetic. The same may be said of the philanthropy and the efforts at reform, which are ultimately checked by the long war with France. Agriculture and industry make great strides, but it is at a heavy cost, not only to the more picturesque elements in them, but in an amount of oppression and suffering unparalleled since the great upheaval of the Reformation. Dress is, through most of the period, extravagant and superabundant; ultimately it exhibits a severe simplicity, due in part to a return to classical models; but in neither case is it attractive. But if the material available to the illustrator has lost in artistic value, it has gained in intellectual interest. Every personage of the period who is in any way worthy of note is presented to us by the art, not only of the portrait painter, but—what is often more effective—by that of the caricaturist, to which the violence of political animosities and the strong personal element in them have given a new vigour and profusion. The examples are often savage and brutal in their satire, and some of the most effective would



require severe expurgation before they could be presented to a modern public; but still they exhibit the rise of the popular element in politics, its tastes and tone of thought, and its realism—exaggerated by contrast with the classical models of the literature of the time, but appealing more effectively to the average mind. We have abundant material for the illustration of our military and naval history; we can study its battles and campaigns even in India or America upon contemporary plans; we can follow the explorers who open up the interior of Africa, and complete our knowledge of the Pacific Ocean and the coast of North-West America on the maps they themselves have made; we can see the scenes they describe, idealised only by the influence of the eighteenth-century doctrine of the superiority of the natural man, which has induced the artists who worked up their rough sketches to represent the savages of the Pacific with something of the dignity traditionally attributed to the Romans of antiquity. If the new agriculture and the new industrialism are less ornamental than the old, at any rate they are infinitely more efficient, and we have abundant material for illustrating their progress. We can point to the map of a county still consisting largely of unenclosed fields, and can exhibit the likenesses of the first sheep bred on scientific principles; we can trace the history of the steam engine from its earliest forms, rude in construction and inordinately wasteful and cumbrous in working, to the scientifically constructed productions of James Watt. We have drawings from the Patent Office and elsewhere, many contemporary models, and some actual examples of machinery to help us. We can, moreover, realise from contemporary views the eighteenth-century aspect of our great towns, of our rural landscapes, even of the streets and places of entertainment in London, and of the races on Newmarket Heath, as well as the pursuits of the visitors at seaside resorts like Scarborough and Brighton. We even know the aspect of a foundry, a prison yard, and a hospital ward. Finally, in this grossly materialistic age we have a development of art which is astonishing and not entirely intelligible. Architecture may have decayed, overborne by classical models and degraded by efforts to reproduce them in cheap material; but industrial art, as exemplified in the pottery of Staffordshire, of Derby, of Bow,

and of Chelsea, has reached a height never equalled since. Even more surprising, however, is the perfection of the highest arts of all. Wealth and leisure, and the habit of foreign travel, have provided a public and a market for painting, engraving, and sculpture; and an unintelligent veneration for Italian art in all its later forms is succeeded by a popular appreciation of the vigorous realism of Hogarth and an outburst of genius in the portraiture of Reynolds and Romney, and in the landscape of Gainsborough and Constable; while the new tendencies of the close of the period are typified in different ways in the art of Wilkie, of Bewick, of Turner, and of Blake.

Our sincere thanks are due to the owners and custodians of numerous portraits and other objects of great historical interest for their generous permission to reproduce them in this work. As in previous volumes, the source of each illustration is noted underneath it; but special acknowledgments are due to His Grace the Duke of Fife, to the Marquis Townshend, the Earl of Derby, the Earl of Carlisle, Earl Stanhope, the Earl of Lichfield, the Rev. the Earl of Strafford, and the Earl of Wharfedale; the Earl of Rosebery, the Earl of Wemyss, and the Earl of Rosse; to Lord Hawke, Lord Sackville, and Lord North; to the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty, for permission to reproduce several pictures at Greenwich Hospital; to the Bishop of Durham, to the Dean of Westminster, to the Dean and Governing Body of Christ Church, Oxford; to the President and Fellows of Trinity College, Oxford, for permission to photograph valuable pieces of College plate; to the Provost and Fellows of Oriel College, Oxford, for permission to reproduce the valuable map by Dean, showing open fields in Oxfordshire; to the Heads and Fellows of Clare, King's, Trinity, Jesus, Pembroke, St. John's, and St. Catherine's Colleges, Cambridge, for permission to reproduce valuable portraits and busts; to the authorities at Glasgow University, at Trinity College, Dublin, at University College, London, and University College, Aberystwith, and to the trustees of St. Mary's College, Blairs, Aberdeen. Our thanks are also due to numerous societies for permission to avail ourselves of their valuable collections: the Royal Society, the Royal Agricultural Society, the Royal College of Surgeons, the Royal College of Physicians, and the Society of


Arts; the Dilettanti Society, for permission to publish two groups of early members by Sir Joshua Reynolds, P.R.A.; the Royal United Service Institution, for permission to reproduce objects of military and naval interest in their Museum; and the Elder Brethren of Trinity House, for a similar permission for objects of maritime interest. Special thanks must be given to the trustees of the National Portrait Gallery, and of the Wallace Collection, Hertford House, and to the Curators, for valuable assistance; to the Curator of the Scottish National Portrait Gallery, Edinburgh, to the Curator of the Royal Museum and Art Galleries, Salford, and to the Corporation of Bath; to the Curators of the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, the Hunterian Museum, Glasgow, and the Museums at Ipswich and York; to Mr. W. O. Swaving, Keeper of the Archives, Middelburg; to the Curator of Sir John Soane's Museum, Lincoln's Inn Fields; and to the Curators and the authorities of the various branches of the Victoria and Albert Museum, South Kensington, and of the British Museum, to whom a special debt of gratitude is due for their unfailing assistance. We must also tender our cordial thanks to Sir Cuthbert Quilter, M.P., the Hon. Mrs. Herbert, C. B. Macpherson, Esq., John Murray, Esq., W. T. Crawshay, Esq., J. D. Atkinson, Esq., John Linnell, Esq., C. Davies Sherborn, Esq.; to the Rev. F. W. Galpin, for placing at our disposal his valuable collection of musical instruments, and for information as to their history and use; to the Above Bar Congregational Church, Southampton, the Carron Company, and the Birmingham Steam Navigations.

Finally, I must express my own indebtedness, as regards the Notes on Illustrations, to the catalogues of the Museum of Machinery and of the Schreiber Collection at South Kensington, to the Catalogue of Satirical Prints, and to Grueber's Handbook of English Coins in the British Museum; to Atkins's *Tradesman's Tokens of the Eighteenth Century*; to Grego's *Rowlandson the Caricaturist*; and, above all, both for facts and for clues to subjects for illustration, to the invaluable *Dictionary of National Biography*.

J. S. MANN.

*March, 1904.*





ROBERT WALPOLE, FIRST EARL OF ORFORD, K.G., IN THE STUDIO OF FRANCIS HAYMAN. R.A.  
(From the painting by Francis Hayman, R.A., *National Portrait Gallery*.)

# SOCIAL ENGLAND

## CHAPTER XVII.

THE AGE OF WALPOLE, 1714-1742; WITH SOME OF THE  
PREPARATIONS FOR IT.

THE history, whether political or social, of the eighteenth century in England cannot possibly be summed up under any one descriptive formula. Were we to restrict our survey to the first half of its course, we should certainly be disposed to pronounce it as on the whole a stationary era in our domestic history. In politics alone are there any discernible signs of advance. Here the work of the Revolution was being slowly completed and consolidated; the modern constitutional system was accumulating its precedents; and the power which a change of dynasty had thrown into the hands of one of the two great political parties was slowly dying of its own abuses. Events were leading, step by step, to the overthrow of that oligarchy which the Whigs had built up on the site, and largely with the materials, of the demolished edifice of Stuart rule; and the ground was being steadily prepared for that re-erection of the constitutional fabric on a broader and more popular basis which but for the panic engendered by the French earthquake—a phenomenon always discouraging to builders—would probably have been accomplished before the century closed.

H. D.  
TRAILL.  
The  
Eighteenth  
Century.

But in most other departments of the national life we shall find, in the earlier part of the century, few signs of active growth. The philosophic thought of the age was mainly critical and destructive; religious sentiment throughout the first half of the century was dormant or declining; art during the same period has no triumphs to record; and

though prose literature indeed throve vigorously, the poetic spirit waned almost to the point of extinction. We have to wait till the century has run more than half its course before trade and agriculture take their forward stride; and it was only after it had entered on its last decade that the age underwent that mighty change from comparative inertia into vehement, and in many respects alarming, activity which gives it a unique place in our history.

ARTHUR  
HASSALL.  
Political  
History.

GEORGE I. arrived in England on September 10th, 1714, and, though not received with much applause, he was supported by all lovers of order and by all the adherents of the Established



SEAL OF GEORGE I.

Church. His accession was a Whig triumph. George, who was a prudent, unostentatious man, had no knowledge of the English constitution, and evinced no intention of endangering his position by trying experiments with a mixed ministry. The extreme Tories had undoubtedly hoped and prepared for a Stuart restoration, and George very naturally placed himself unreservedly in the hands of the Whigs. Townshend (p. 143), who had made the Barrier Treaty, became Prime Minister, and the other leading members of the Government were Stanhope, Sunderland, Cowper, Nottingham, Pulteney, Marlborough, and Walpole. Of these Townshend, Stanhope, and Walpole carried the greatest weight. In the election which occurred six months after Anne's death, the influence of the Government secured the return of a large Whig majority,

1742]

and from 1715 to the accession of George III. the ascendancy of the Whigs continued without any intermission. During this long period of Whig rule the main principles of government became fixed, and the effects of the Revolution of 1688 were fully worked out. Owing to the interest taken by George I. and George II. in Hanoverian politics and their own ignorance of English customs and usages, the chief direction of affairs fell into the hands of the ministers, Cabinet government was

Constitutional  
Development.



*Photo: Walker & Cockerell, Clifford's Inn, W.C.*

JAMES, FIRST EARL STANHOPE, BY SIR G. KNELLER.

*(National Portrait Gallery.)*

in great measure established, and our Parliamentary system gradually assumed the features which now distinguish it.

Townshend's ministry, which lasted from 1714 to 1717, was mainly occupied in securing the peaceful accession of the new dynasty and defending it from disaffection in England and from a Jacobite rebellion in Scotland. Riots which had broken out at the close of 1714 showed plainly that the country was Tory, though not Jacobite at heart—*i.e.* though the majority of Englishmen were strongly in favour of hereditary right,



their devotion to the Established Church prevented them from supporting the Pretender so long as he remained a Roman Catholic. Their attitude, therefore, to the new king was one of sullen hostility. George was disliked as a foreigner, but since the Pretender refused to recant, the Government had no cause to fear the active opposition of any large section of Englishmen.

By the elections held at the beginning of 1715 the Whigs secured a large majority, and at once took measures against their opponents. Bolingbroke fled to France and entered into the service of the Pretender; Ormond followed his example, and both fugitives were attainted; Oxford was impeached, remained without trial in the Tower for two years, and then



COIN FROM A DIE OF JAMES EDWARD, THE PRETENDER.  
(Three-quarter scale.)

The  
Jacobite  
Rising.

was acquitted. These severe measures tended still further to alienate the Tory party, to increase the hopes of the Jacobites, and to bring about the outbreak of the Rebellion in 1715. On September 6th, 1715, James Edward's standard was raised at Kirkmichael, in October Mackintosh joined Foster and Kenmare, and on November 12th the Jacobites were defeated at Preston, and all danger of an insurrection in England was over. The indecisive battle of Sheriffmuir (p 14) was fought on November 13th, and was followed by the rapid dispersion of the Highlanders. At the end of December James Edward landed in Scotland only to find that the rising had failed, and on February 4th, 1716, he re-embarked for France. Want of good management, the lack of help from France, the non-appearance of the Pretender at the opening of the

struggle, and the failure of the English Jacobites to effect a general and simultaneous rising in Scotland were the principal causes of the collapse of the Jacobite rebellion. Many Jacobites were executed, Bolingbroke was dismissed from the Pretender's service, and the Regent Orleans and Dubois inclined towards an alliance with George I. The Whigs had secured a signal triumph. The influence of the Church had received a severe blow: it remained for the Government to strengthen its position and that of the Hanoverian dynasty. In 1716 the Septennial Act was passed, due to the conviction that elections held at that juncture would cause disorders and tumults, even if they did not result in the overthrow of the Government. In spite of the drawbacks attending a measure which tended to increase corruption at elections and in the House of Commons, and to bring the country gentlemen for a longer period to London, the Septennial Act undoubtedly contributed to secure the stability of the Hanoverian dynasty, to lessen the number of elections, to increase the power of the House of Commons, and to ensure the continuity of England's foreign policy. There is no doubt that the circumstances of the time justified the passing of the Act.

In 1717 occurred the famous Whig Schism—the beginning of those divisions which eventually enabled George III. to assert his own personal authority and to place the Tories in power. In 1716 George I. went to Hanover with Stanhope, and in his absence Townshend supported the Prince of Wales in a quarrel with his father, and made himself very unpopular with the king's Hanoverian favourites in England. He also strongly disapproved of the suspicious attitude taken by George and his



ROBERT POWEL, THE PUPPET  
SHOW-MAN.

(From a book satirising the Earl of Oxford.)

**The  
Whig  
Schism.**


Stanhope's  
Ministry.

Hanoverian ministers towards England's ally, Peter the Great, who was helping us against Charles XII. of Sweden. Personal dislike on the part of the king for Townshend and Walpole, coupled with the intrigues of Charles, Earl of Sunderland against his colleagues, helped to bring matters to a crisis. On December 15th, 1716, Townshend was dismissed, and on April 10th, after a sharp debate on a motion to grant George money for the Swedish war, Walpole and Pulteney resigned, and a few days later Oxford and Devonshire followed their example. Stanhope became First Lord of the Treasury and Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Sunderland and Addison Secretaries of State. The new Ministry closed Convocation and so dealt a severe blow at the independence of the Established Church. It alleviated the position of the Dissenters by its repeal of the Schism Act, which restricted their educational facilities, and the Occasional Conformity Act, which interfered with their holding municipal and other offices—both products of the Jacobite Toryism of Anne's reign (IV., p. 706). But it failed to carry the Peerage Bill restricting the right of the Crown to create Peers.<sup>1</sup> In 1720 Walpole and Townshend again joined the Government, which was shortly afterwards overthrown, Stanhope, Craggs, and other ministers being involved in the "South Sea Bubble" (p. 168). Stanhope's fall established the ascendancy of Walpole and Townshend, and the former remained Chancellor of the Exchequer, and the ruling spirit in the Cabinet from 1721 to 1742, with the exception of the six weeks following the death of George I. During his ministry the Cabinet system was considerably developed, though it was not till the time of the younger Pitt that it was secure from the interference of the sovereign.

Walpole  
in Office,  
1721-1742.

Walpole's long tenure of office was due to a variety of causes. He was supported by the moneyed classes and by the Dissenters, who were promised the repeal of the Test and the Corporations Acts. He gained, moreover, a firm ascendancy over both his royal masters. His peace policy was, during most of his career, advantageous to English interests, and secured for the country that immense material development which was

<sup>1</sup> Had this passed, the rule of the Whig oligarchy would have been rendered perpetual, and no constitutional means would have existed for overcoming the opposition of the Lords to the wishes of the Crown or the Commons.



AN ELECTION WON BY BRIBERY.

(From a print of 1757.)

the principal cause of our successes in the great wars of the century. The expulsion of Bolingbroke from the House of Lords, the long absence of Carteret in Ireland, and the death of Sunderland relieved him from much serious opposition in the early years of his ministry, while his unvarying respect for the wishes of the people in all matters except that of Parliamentary corruption rendered his position undeniably strong. His influence in the House of Commons was immense, and to him that House owes its great importance in the reigns of the first two Georges. Bribery was reduced to an organised system: and that, combined with his singular skill in management, his good humour, tact, and frankness, rendered the sway of the great Commoner irresistibly powerful (p. 158).

He was equally opposed to the Jacobites and the Roman Catholics, and to the entry of England into any European war; he was very sensitive to opposition on the part of his colleagues, he had a great dislike of change or innovation, his influence on the Church was baneful, he was ignorant if not contemptuous of literature.

The Oppo-  
sition.

Gradually a powerful opposition grew up which at the end of 1726 began a series of fierce attacks on the home and foreign policy of the ministry. This opposition consisted of the Hanoverian Tories under Wyndham, the discontented Whigs under Pulteney, and the Jacobites under Shippen and Barnard. In the reign of George II. this opposition was strengthened by the support of a number of "Boy Patriots," as they were called, including Pitt and Chesterfield. The work of Bolingbroke and Pulteney was to organise all these various elements into a compact opposition. For this the *Craftsman* was started, and for many years attacked Walpole's ministry with extraordinary violence.

The  
Reign of  
George II.

In 1727 the death of George I. was followed by a brief period during which Sir Spencer Compton ousted Walpole from office. The latter was soon found to be indispensable, and after a short interval he returned to power, supported by George II., and more especially by the queen. In 1730 Townshend retired from the ministry, having differed from Walpole on questions of foreign policy, and having realised that his influence with George II. was less than that of his brother-in-law. The ascendancy of Walpole was now absolute and uncontrolled, and

was confirmed by the hopeless condition of the Jacobites, by the continuance of peace, and by the growing prosperity at home.

In 1733 he attempted to introduce his one measure of importance, the Excise Bill (p. 162 *seq.*). Upon its withdrawal, Chesterfield, who had voted against it, was dismissed from his office of Lord Steward of the Household, and with him several

The Ex-  
cise Bill



THE HOUSE OF COMMONS IN 1742.

(From an engraving by Pine, after Gravelot.)

other holders of Government posts. Walpole's majority seemed as strong as ever, and Bolingbroke, despairing of success, retired in 1734 to the Continent.

The death of the queen, on November 20th, 1737, was a serious blow to Walpole, and the Opposition fondly hoped that his overthrow would take place. But the king's support of his minister was not withdrawn. In October, 1739, in deference to public opinion (p. 17), Walpole declared war against Spain, but it was not till 1741 that his difficulties began to prove too

much for him. The failure of the English operations against Spain, and the general dissatisfaction at the foreign policy of the minister, led to his fall, and on February 3rd, 1742, Walpole resigned.

Walpole's  
Work.

By a policy of peace and conciliation, by careful administration and sound finance, by Parliamentary management and bribery, and by securing the support of the Queen Caroline, Walpole succeeded in firmly establishing the Hanoverian dynasty on the throne and in promoting the national prosperity. His fall, while it brought no change in the domestic policy of the Government, was followed by a new departure in foreign policy. "The fall of Walpole," says von Ranke, "was not the fall of an ordinary minister, but the fall of the political system based upon the first union of the House of Hanover with the Regent of France."

ARTHUR  
HASSALL.  
England  
and  
Europe.

THE foreign policy of George I.'s Government was successful in so far as the maintenance of peace was concerned; but it was marked by two serious defects. The Whig Ministers, by allowing the encroachments of the Emperor in Italy, showed no appreciation of the existence of national feeling in that country, while their northern policy was affected by the Hanoverian predilections of George I. In their desire for peace the ministers were consulting the true interests of the country. England had but lately emerged from a severe war, and required rest and freedom from foreign complications. The position of George I. remained precarious even after the suppression of the Rebellion of 1715, and it was well known that the Pretender and his supporters only awaited an opportunity to make another attempt to upset the Hanoverian Government. On the Continent things were still in a very disturbed state; Austria and Spain had not made peace, and the Emperor still claimed the throne of Spain, while in the North of Europe a league of the Powers of the Baltic had been formed against Charles XII. of Sweden. Confronted by all these difficulties, it behoved Stanhope to walk warily. Anxious to prevent the Pretender from gaining assistance from France, and alarmed at the aggressive attitude of Peter the Great in Mecklenburg,<sup>1</sup> George I. willingly accepted

<sup>1</sup> While supporting his nephew, the Duke of Mecklenburg, Peter seemed to aim at the establishment of Russian influence in the Duchy.

1742]

the overtures of the French Minister Dubois, whom he met at The Hague, and again in Hanover. The Regent Orleans, who governed France on behalf of his nephew, the young Louis XV., feared an attempt on the part of Philip V., King of Spain, to secure the Regency for himself, and was anxious to obtain an English alliance. In December, 1716, the two countries made a treaty which, with the adhesion of Holland on January 4th, 1717, became known as the Triple Alliance. This Triple Alliance was at once recognised as a very important event for Europe. For over twenty years England and France, lately enemies, remained allies, and prevented the outbreak of any considerable war till 1733. The Triple Alliance was a great blow to the Jacobites, and the Pretender was forced to take refuge in Lorraine. France, after the late exhausting war, was enabled to enjoy a period of much-needed rest, to decline the proffered Russian alliance, and to reduce her expenditure.

The Triple  
Alliance.

For a time, however, this new friendship between England and France seemed only to increase the difficulties of the situation. Both the emperor and Philip of Spain were furious at the treaty. With England Spain, under her capable minister Alberoni, had concluded a commercial treaty at the end of 1715, followed by the final settlement of the Assiento Treaty in 1716 (p. 17). With Austria England had concluded the Treaty of Westminster in May, 1716. Both Spain and Austria now felt outwitted, each having hoped that England would aid them against the other, and the next question which Stanhope found himself compelled to settle was concerned with the rival claims of these two Powers. By the Treaty of Utrecht Naples and Sardinia had been given to Austria and Sicily to the Duke of Savoy, with the title of king, the reversion of the island being settled upon the Spanish rulers in the event of the line of Savoy becoming extinct. The emperor was determined to exchange Sardinia for Sicily; and when the Spaniards, being aware of his purpose, occupied Sardinia in 1717 and Sicily in 1718, they were only acting in defence of their undoubted rights. Stanhope, however, was resolved at all hazards to preserve peace in the South of Europe. He and Orleans determined to support the emperor's pretensions to Sicily, and an English fleet, under Admiral Byng, defeated the Spanish fleet off Cape Passaro on August 11th, 1718 (p. 26), and at one blow overthrew all the plans



It becomes  
Quadruple.

of Philip V. and Alberoni. Austria joined the Triple Alliance, which now became known as the Quadruple Alliance, and was allowed to exchange Sardinia for Sicily; Spanish dockyards and ships were attacked by the English fleet, while Spain was invaded in the spring of 1719 by a French army; and at the end of the year Alberoni, on the urgent representations of Stanhope, was dismissed. Early in 1720 Philip V. agreed to the terms of the Quadruple Alliance, by which Don Carlos, the eldest son of his second wife, Elizabeth Farnese, was promised the eventual succession to the Duchies of Parma and Piacenza and the Grand Duchy of Tuscany.

Though Stanhope's policy had been shortsighted and high-handed; though he had alienated Spain, from whom he might have gained valuable commercial concessions; though he had ignored the aspirations of the Italians to be freed from the German yoke; and though he had not considered the interests of English trade in the Mediterranean, he could at any rate point to the fact that, by the Quadruple Alliance, he had pacified the South of Europe.

Northern  
Europe.

The failure of Alberoni's attempt to check the German encroachments in Italy enabled Stanhope to turn his attention to the Baltic, where the northern war was raging. Denmark, unable to keep Bremen and Verden, which she had seized from Sweden, had handed them over to George, who wished to annex them to his electorate. The Emperor's ratification of the cession was necessary, and this had been to some extent secured by the Treaty of Westminster in 1716.

In order to aid George to extend his Electorate, and to protect it during the northern war, Stanhope had disregarded the Treaty of Utrecht and ignored the interests of Italy. But the influence of the Hanoverian advisers of George I. brought about a coolness between England and Russia. The dubious conduct of the Tsar with regard to Mecklenburg had raised general suspicion, which, carefully fostered by Alberoni, would have led to an alliance between Peter the Great and Charles XII. had not the latter been killed at the close of the year 1718. The simultaneous overthrow of two such men as Alberoni and Charles XII. produced a feeling of relief in both England and France. Sweden at once renounced her policy of alliance with Russia, and, guided

1742]

by Carteret's advice, made treaties with Hanover, England, Prussia, Poland, and Denmark.

Though England failed in her endeavour to aid Sweden in the war which broke out between her and Russia, French mediation brought about the Peace of Nystad between the two countries in 1721, and Stanhope and Dubois had the satisfaction of seeing their policy of peace successfully carried out; England, in alliance with France and Germany, had no cause to fear a Jacobite invasion, and George I. was secure on the English throne.

Walpole's policy was one of peace and a French alliance, but until the retirement of Townshend in 1730 he was not personally responsible for the foreign policy of the ministry. During the years from 1721 to 1729 Europe was in constant turmoil owing to the schemes of Elizabeth Farnese to secure Italian duchies for her sons, while the English ministry was hampered in its relations with Spain on account

of a promise made by George I. in 1721 to restore Gibraltar, and in its relations with Austria by the determination of Charles VI. to support his Ostend East India Company. The unnatural alliance arranged between Spain and Austria in 1725 by the Treaty of Vienna was followed by the counter Treaty or Hanover, the work of Townshend and Bourbon, and of which Walpole strongly disapproved. War actually broke out with



*Photo: Walker & Coe erect.*  
GEORGE II., BY JOHN SHACKLETON.

(National Portrait Gallery.)

**Walpole's  
Foreign  
Policy.**

Spain in 1727, but beyond the disastrous blockade by Admiral Hosier of Porto Bello and a short siege of Gibraltar by Spain (p. 15), no serious hostilities occurred. The Treaty of Seville in 1729, followed by the Treaty of Vienna in 1731, were signal proofs of Walpole's pacific policy, though he could not avoid giving Charles VI. a guarantee of the Pragmatic Sanction which secured the succession to his dominions.

In 1733 the War of the Polish Succession began, and Holland's refusal to take any part in the struggle strengthened Walpole in his fixed resolve to remain faithful to the French Alliance. The Austrian Court bitterly reproached England for her neutrality and desertion of an old ally, and Carteret, whose knowledge of foreign affairs was profound, supported the view that England's interests demanded that the power of the Bourbons should be checked. But Walpole feared a Jacobite invasion, backed by French gold and arms, and perhaps by French regiments, and England remained at peace till 1739. In that year the Opposition succeeded in forcing Walpole into war with Spain. For many years commercial and colonial disputes between England and Spain had been of frequent occurrence, and the episode of Jenkins's ear (p. 17) had aroused public feeling. Most reluctantly Walpole declared war, and in 1741 found that England was likely to be involved in a still wider struggle caused by the attack on Maria Theresa by France, Prussia, Spain, Sardinia, Saxony, and Bavaria. His management of the war against Spain was inefficient, and when he resigned, at the beginning of 1742, it was evident that his system of a French alliance had come to an end, and that England was on the verge of a great struggle to preserve the balance of power on the sea against the Bourbons.

The War  
with  
Spain.

G. LE M.  
GRETTON.  
The Army.

THERE is probably no period of modern English history more lacking in military interest than the twenty-eight years with which this chapter deals. In Britain there was the abortive Jacobite rising known as "The '15," when one wing of the Scottish rebels marched as far as Preston in Lancashire before they were dispersed; while the other, under the Earl of Mar, attacked King George's troops at Sheriffmuir, near

Stirling. As at Killlicrankie, where in 1689 the rush of the Highlanders had swept the English infantry before them, so at Sheriffmuir, it was proved that many of our professional troops were not yet steady enough to withstand a charge of wild Celtic mountaineers. Where the clans were opposed by red-coated foot-soldiers only, they carried all before them; but a counter attack of cavalry routed part of their line, and converted the Hanoverian defeat into a drawn battle.

The  
Jacobite  
Rising.

In the Mediterranean, the naval war with Spain kept the garrisons of Minorca and Gibraltar on the alert. In 1720 our spies discovered that the Spaniards were preparing

Gibraltar



GIBALTAR IN 1730, BY COQUART.

for a *coup de main* against the Rock. The garrison had been reduced to three weak battalions, with provisions for fourteen days only; but reinforcements from Minorca were hastily thrown in, and for the time the danger was averted. In 1727 the storm burst, and the fortress underwent a siege, the memory of which has been eclipsed by the glories of the Great Siege of half a century later. Yet in 1727 the attack, though by land only, was vigorous; and at first the position of the British was an anxious one. Against the investing force of 19,000 Spaniards, we could muster but 1,500 men. To reply to the 164 guns and mortars, from which 700 projectiles could be hurled hourly against our batteries, there were only 58 guns in position, many of which were of very light calibre. Within the walls treason


was at work. Then, as now, Jews and Moors swarmed on the Rock, eager for gain, however acquired. Some of these worthies agreed with the Spaniards to seize the gates and throw them open at a given time. The conspiracy was detected; the culprits were executed and flayed, and their skins were nailed to the gates of the fortress as a grim object-lesson on the disadvantages of unsuccessful treachery. Our command of the sea soon enabled Government to land large reinforcements of men and of warlike stores. The garrison was increased to 7,000 men; more guns were mounted; the artillery duel became more equal. Gradually our fire completely overpowered that of the Spaniards; we destroyed 96 of their guns and mortars, and so demoralised their gunners that the bombardment ceased. After five months the siege was raised, and peace was made between the two countries—a peace destined to be soon broken by our disastrous expedition against Carthage and the Spanish Main.

The Con-  
flict with  
Spain.

The traditional policy of Spain has been to close her colonial ports against foreign merchants and foreign goods; and against this policy the commercial instincts of England have ever chafed. By the Treaty of Utrecht (1713), in addition to various accessions of territory to the Crown (such as Nova Scotia, Gibraltar, Hudson's Bay, and the islands of Newfoundland, Minorca, and St. Kitts), an important privilege was obtained for British traders. By the Assiento Treaty (1716; p. 11) Spain granted to an English company the temporary monopoly of the slave trade with the Spanish colonies, and thus gave Englishmen a footing in these countries. Three years later England further acquired the right to send one trading-ship of 600 tons annually to Panama. Our traders were active, pushing, unscrupulous, and determined to take an ell for every inch wrung from the reluctant Spaniards. An immense amount of smuggling was carried on under our flag; and when the annual ship sailed with her freight, other vessels followed in her wake, and secretly refilled her at night as she lay in the Spanish port. Thus the cargo of the one ship became almost inexhaustible. The Spanish Custom House officials were brutal and oppressive; they maltreated our

1742]

sailors, and searched our ships on the high seas. Each nation had undoubted grievances against the other; each was haughty and unconciliatory; each became eager for revenge. Walpole struggled, but in vain, against the war party. The patriots, as the latter styled themselves, brought a sea captain named Jenkins to the bar of the House of Commons, to describe the outrages to which he professed to have been subjected by the commander of a Spanish revenue ship. This official, Jenkins stated, boarded his vessel and charged him



PORTO BELLO IN 1740, BY LIEUT. DURELL.

(From a contemporary sketch-plan.)

with smuggling; but, finding nothing contraband on board, revenged himself by tearing off Jenkins's ear. When asked what his feelings had been, Jenkins electrified all England by replying: "I commended my soul to God, and my cause to my country."

Whether Jenkins's story was true or not, it roused the British to frenzy, and Walpole, against his convictions but to save his place, declared war against Spain. Our first blow was directed against Porto Bello, then an important trading centre on the Atlantic side of the Isthmus of Panama, not far from the site of the modern city of Aspinwall.

The  
Attack  
on Porto  
Bello.

Vernon, a hitherto unknown admiral, with six men-of-war and a handful of soldiers demolished its fortifications. This exploit turned the nation's head. Nothing less was demanded than the total destruction of the Spanish settlements in the New World. Anson was sent with a squadron to ravage the coasts of Chili and Peru (p. 292). To Vernon, who had become the popular idol, was entrusted the naval command of the expedition which in 1740 was despatched against the Spanish possessions in the Gulf of Mexico. Including the transports, which carried 10,000 troops, Vernon was responsible for no fewer than 115 vessels, manned by 15,000 seamen. With so noble an armament success appeared assured; but the deep-rooted jealousy which existed between the two branches of the service ruined the expedition. As long as Lord Cathcart was commander of the troops all went well. His good sense and tact are displayed in his celebrated letter to Vernon. "In the troops I bring you there is spirit, there is good will; which, when properly conducted, will produce, I hope, what the nation expects from us—will make us the glorious instruments of finishing the war, with all the advantages to the public that its happy beginning promises; and with this distinguishing circumstance, that those happy effects have been owing to a perfect harmony between the sea and the land forces." Cathcart unfortunately died before active operations commenced; and the command of the troops devolved upon General Wentworth, who had nothing in common with Vernon but his obstinacy, and who possessed as great a contempt for the Navy as the admiral had for the sister service.

British  
Failure  
at Car-  
thagena.

It was determined to attack Carthagena, then an important and strongly fortified town on the Caribbean Sea, on the west coast of the country which is now known as the United States of Colombia. With incredible stupidity Vernon divulged to a French acquaintance the object of the expedition. The Frenchman instantly warned the Spaniards, who thus had time to increase the garrison to 4,000 men, to mount 300 guns, and to make all the necessary preparations for defence. Yet when, in March, 1741, the British fleet appeared off Carthagena, at first it carried all before it; and the fortifications of the outer harbour were breached and stormed. After this





one success, however, nothing went well. Vernon and Wentworth quarrelled. The admiral sneered at the soldiers for not instantly taking the main fortress by storm, and continually railed against what he termed "their laziness." The general complained of the sailors' refusal to land his tents, stores, and artillery, and persistently inquired why Vernon's warships did not bombard the town. At length, after great delay, an attempt was made to breach the walls of the most important Spanish work—the fort of St. Lazarus; but before the breach was practicable, Vernon goaded Wentworth into making an attack in which everything was mismanaged. It was intended that the assault should be delivered by night, but sunrise found the storming column, 1,200 strong, impatiently awaiting the signal to advance. When the welcome order was at length received, the men sprang joyfully forward; but the Spanish deserters who were their guides led them against the strongest face of the fort, not against the weakest, as had been arranged. The scaling-ladders proved to be too short; the hand grenades had been forgotten. The main body of the troops made no feigned attacks to distract the enemy's attention. The navy remained inactive; hardly a shot was fired into the town by Vernon's twenty-seven line-of-battle ships, his bomb-ketches, or his numerous frigates. The assaulting column, exposed in front and in flank to a withering fire, unable to reach their enemy, unsupported by their comrades or by the fleet, sullenly retired. They left 600 men—half their original number—dead or wounded on the *glacis* of Fort Lazarus, victims to the jealousy and incapacity of their unworthy chiefs. This one reverse and the unhealthiness of the climate induced Vernon and Wentworth to re-embark the troops and sail for Jamaica. After various abortive demonstrations against other Spanish colonies, the expedition straggled back to England. They left behind them the bones of about 15,000 men, of whom the vast majority had succumbed to the effects of the climate and to the neglect of all medical and sanitary precautions which disgraced this miserable campaign. The American colonies, as well as the mother country, had bitter cause to remember the Carthagena expedition, for among the troops engaged were four battalions of New England Volunteers, of

1742]

whom scarcely one man in fifty returned to his native province.

While our arms were being thus disgraced in the West Indies, George II. plunged the country into the war of the Austrian Succession. To assist the cause of Maria Theresa our army was increased to 62,000 men; and a corps of 16,000 British troops was despatched to the Continent, once more to face the French upon the blood-stained plains of

The War  
of the  
Austrian  
Succession.



*Photo: Walker & Cocherell.*

GENERAL JAMES WOLFE.

(National Portrait Gallery)

Flanders. To the next chapter belongs the account of this war; but it will be convenient here to anticipate, and to touch on the condition of the Army as described by General Wolfe in his letters to his father. James Wolfe joined in 1742; he served with distinction in the Low Countries and in Scotland; in 1755 he was one of the men marked for speedy promotion. Yet in that year he thus writes to his father, an old officer of high standing:—

The State  
of the  
Army.

"I have but a very mean opinion of the infantry in general. I know their discipline to be bad, and their valour precarious. They are easy to be put into disorder and hard to recover out of it. They frequently kill their officers through fear, and murder each other in the confusion. . . . I am sorry to say that our method of training and instructing the troops is extremely defective and tends to no good end. We are lazy in time of peace, and of course, want vigilance and activity in time of war. Our military education is by far the worst in Europe, and all our concerns are treated with contempt or wholly neglected."

The condition of Portsmouth (p. 290), then, as now, one of our chief garrison towns, he thus describes:—

"There is not the least shadow of discipline, care or attention. Disorderly soldiers . . . are collected here; some from the ships, others from the hospital, others waiting to embark—dirty, drunken, insolent scoundrels improved by the hellish nature of the place, where every kind of corruption, immorality, and looseness is carried to excess."

Recruit-  
ing.

Many of the rank and file required no "improving" in Portsmouth; they were already the lowest of the low. Recruiting for the army was managed in the time of the Georges in the same way as it had been in the reign of Queen Anne. Tramps, loafers, and gaol-birds were pressed into the ranks, and forced to serve for life, or as long as the king required them; and bounties were given to men who enlisted voluntarily. During the Seven Years' War the supply of recruits ran so short that the bounty offered by Government ceased to attract them. Several large towns opened subscription lists to raise a fund with which to supplement the efforts of the recruiting-sergeants; and in London alone, £7,039 was collected, which procured 1,235 recruits at the price of £5 5s. per head.

Military  
Morals.

Towards his brother officers Wolfe is hardly more complimentary than towards the men. In another letter he says that if he stays much longer with his regiment he will become "perfectly corrupt, for the officers are loose and profligate and the soldiers are very devils." Much must be forgiven to men who led the lives of unutterable dulness which Wolfe describes in country quarters. When commanding his battalion at Dover Castle, he found the afternoons hang so heavy that "expedients were wanting to divert the time."






UNIFORMS OF THE BRITISH ARMY, 1742.

"Our conversation from dinner till 5 o'clock is kept up with some difficulty, none of us have any correspondence with the capital, nor communication with coffee-houses or public papers, so that we are entirely in the dark as to exterior things. From 5 to 8 is a tedious interval hardly to be worked through."

If garrison life was monotonous, officers on leave occasionally took refuge in strong excitements. A captain mortally wounded a publican who ventured to present a bill for wine consumed in a tavern. Two subalterns, travelling post, became annoyed with the post-boy for walking his horses up a hill and ran him through the body.

In a service where such slackness and demoralisation existed, it is not surprising that the drill was bad. The future hero of Quebec complains that no instructions for the training

DRILL.



GENERAL WOLFE'S SWORD.

(United Service Institution, Whitehall.)

of a battalion had ever been issued in his time, nor any general principles laid down by which officers could be guided. "Hence the variety of steps in our infantry and the disorderly floating of our lines." The art of marksmanship seems to have been generally ignored, for Wolfe, in a letter to a friend, earnestly begs him to teach his troops to fire with ball.

"Let me recommend the practice, you will soon find the advantage of it. . . . It may not have been thought of by your commander, and I have experience of its great utility."

Wolfe's course of musketry was admirable; as he details it to his friend it reads like a page out of a modern circular from Hythe:

"Firing balls at objects teaches the soldiers to level incomparably, makes the recruit steady, and removes the foolish apprehension that seizes young soldiers when they first load their arms with bullets. We fire first singly, then by files, one, two, three, or more, and lastly by platoons; and the

soldiers see the effect of their shots—especially at a mark or upon water. We shoot obliquely and on different situations of ground, from heights downwards or contrariwise.”<sup>1</sup>

#### Tactics.

During the first half of the eighteenth century there were no marked improvements in tactics. Cavalry had degenerated into unwieldy masses of horsemen who, unable to move at speed, charged at a slow trot, and fought only with pistol and carbine; while infantry attacked in heavy columns, and did little execution with their muskets, which they preferred to use as pikes. Then a great military reformer arose and astonished Europe. Frederick the Great reorganised his cavalry; he taught them to manœuvre at full speed, to charge at the gallop, and, discarding the use of firearms, to rely for victory on shock action and the cold steel. His infantry were so perfectly drilled and disciplined that he could trust them to attack in line; and he relied as much on his musketry fire as on the bayonet for his success in battle. By dint of incessant practice he trained his foot-soldiers to load and fire more rapidly than any other troops in Europe. It is stated on good authority that they could on an emergency fire five steady volleys in one minute. In artillery Frederick also made improvements, for he realised that to thoroughly develop its value on the



STATUETTE OF FREDERICK  
THE GREAT.

(Victoria and Albert Museum.)

battle-field guns should be able to change their position rapidly, as the varying phases of the combat require. He therefore formed light batteries, so powerfully horsed that they were able to keep up with cavalry moving at full speed. Frederick's daring innovation in abandoning the column and adopting the line as the formation for attack at first filled Europe with amazement, then, as its success became apparent, with admiration. Though by no

<sup>1</sup> These extracts from Wolfe's letters are taken from Wright's valuable "Life of Wolfe."

means adapted to the soldiery of every nation, this formation suited the genius of the English so well that it has become part of the national system of tactics. It appears to have been employed for the first time in our army at the battle of Minden in 1759, where our contingent of infantry, advancing in lines across a plain swept by the fire of many batteries, triumphantly met the charge of more than sixty French squadrons, whom, by our steady and extended fire, we defeated and partially destroyed.

ON the deaths of William III. in 1702, of Anne in 1714, of George I. in 1727, and of George II. in 1760 respectively, the material strength of the Royal Navy, so far as rated ships were concerned, was as follows:—

W. LAIRD  
CLOWES.  
The Navy.

	1702.		1714.		1727.		1760.	
	No.	Tons.	No.	Tons.	No.	Tons.	No.	Tons.
First rates ...	7	10,955	7	11,703	7	12,945	5	9,958
Second rates ...	14	19,447	13	19,323	13	20,125	13	22,825
Third rates ...	47	51,988	42	47,768	40	47,958	74	109,494
Fourth rates ...	62	42,940	69	51,379	64	50,754	63	67,901
Fifth rates ...	30	11,469	42	19,836	27	15,065	54	39,173
Sixth rates ...	15	3,611	24	6,435	27	9,760	61	31,618
	175	140,410	197	156,444	178	156,607	270	280,969

First-rates, it may be explained, were vessels of 100 guns or upwards on three complete decks; second-rates, of from 90 to 100 guns on three decks; third-rates, of from 64 to 84 guns on two complete decks; fourth-rates, of from 50 to 60 guns on two decks; fifth-rates, of from 30 to 44 guns; and sixth-rates, of from 20 to 30 guns. These were captains' commands. Smaller vessels, classed as sloops, were commanded by commanders, and still smaller ones, such as gun-brigs and bombs, by lieutenants. But the system of rating men-of-war had been, until the reign of Anne, somewhat irregular. Rating was introduced, it is true, in the middle of the seventeenth century. Up to the end of that century, however, we find 64's and 70's classed as second-rates, 60's as third-rates, and 30's and 32's as fourth-rates. Progress in matter of size was more conspicuous after the commencement of the eighteenth century than it had been up to the end of the reign of William, when there was no vessel of more than 1,700 tons burthen in the Navy.

The  
Ships.



Before the death of George II., a first-rate (the *Royal George*), of 2,047 tons; a second-rate (the *Sandwich*), of 1,869 tons; a third-rate (the *Valiant*), of 1,799 tons; and a fourth-rate (the *Chatham*), of 1,052 tons, had been built. Thus, in the course of about fifty years, the new fourth-rates had grown to be as large as the old third-rates, and the new third-rates to be even larger than the old first-rates. And the weight of armament of most of the rates had increased proportionately. For example, a 90-gun second rate of 1716 threw 1,606 lb. of metal, but a 90-gun second-rate of 1745 threw 1,684 lb.; a 70-gun third-rate of 1716 threw 1,056 lb., but a 70-gun third-rate of 1745 threw 1,480 lb.; and a 50-gun fourth-rate of 1716 threw 642

#### The Guns.



MEDAL COMMEMORATING THE SEA FIGHT OFF CAPE PASSARO, 1718.

lb., but a 50-gun fourth-rate of 1745 threw 840 lb. Similarly, the strength and weight of all gear increased. The weight of bower anchors was, for instance: for a first-rate in 1706, 74 cwt., in 1747, 81 cwt.; for a second-rate in 1706, 66½ cwt., in 1747, 73½ cwt.; for a third-rate in 1706, 49 cwt., in 1747, 58¾ cwt.; and for a fourth-rate in 1706, 36½ cwt., in 1747, 49 cwt.

#### Timber.

Attention has already been directed (IV., p. 67) to the manner in which the timber of the *Sovereign of the Seas*, of 1637, had been seasoned. In 1684 it had been found that all the ancient wood then in the ship was so hard that "it was no easy matter to drive a nail into it." Another method was tried, early in the eighteenth century, with the *Royal William*, a small first-rate, which, launched in 1719, remained in commission, latterly as an

84, until long after the beginning of the nineteenth century, though she was not in her old age sent to sea. The thick stuff and plank were burnt, instead of being merely kilned, as had been usual; and the ends of the beams, the faying parts of the breast-hooks, crutches, riders, knees, etc., were gouged, or "snail-creeped," in order to admit of the circulation of air in parts where otherwise there would have been none. Later, Mr. Barnard, a progressive builder of Harwich, who in 1757 launched the *Achilles*, 60, put into her, unknown to the Navy Board, winter-felled timber, which he had barked in the previous spring. In 1770 the timbers of the frame were observed to be unusually sound; and the ship was by no means in bad condition when she was sold in 1784, though she had previously been much neglected.

At this period, and until nearly the middle of the eighteenth century, the flag-list was of very modest proportions, and betrayed no tendency to swell to the enormous size which it assumed later. The list consisted merely of an admiral of the fleet—or, as he was then called, an admiral and commander-in-chief—an admiral of the white squadron, an admiral of the blue, a vice-admiral of the red, one of the white, and one of the blue, and a rear-admiral of the red, one of the white, and one of the blue, or nine flag-officers in all, with sometimes three more holding the offices of admiral, vice-admiral, and rear-admiral of Great Britain. The rank of superannuated, or retired, rear-admiral was not established until 1747; so that at most there were but twelve flag-officers at any given moment. Promotion from post-rank was, consequently, increasingly slow, for though there were so few admirals, there were always, necessarily, many captains. Sir John Leak, made a rear-admiral in 1703, had been a captain only fourteen years; Sir Edward Whitaker, made in 1705, was of fifteen years' standing; Sir John Norris, in 1707, was of seventeen years'; Sir Hovenden Walker, in 1710, was of eighteen years'; James Littleton, in 1716, was of twenty-three years'; Francis Hosier, in 1720, was of twenty-four years'; Sir George Walton, in 1723, was of twenty-six years'; Salmon Morrice, in 1727, was of thirty years'; Sir Chaloner Ogle, in 1739, was of thirty-one years'; Richard Lestock, in 1742, was of thirty-six years'; and thus the age of flag-officers mounted steadily until, in order to have

admirals who were still fit for employment, the Admiralty was driven not only to enlarge the list but also to formulate a scheme of retirement for very old captains. The enlargement of the list began in 1742; the scheme of retirement came into force, as has been said, in 1747, when the first captain who took advantage of it was of nearly forty years' standing.

Admiral  
of the  
Red.

It will have been noticed that the rank, so called, of admiral of the red did not exist. The position was filled by the admiral of the fleet, who, however, flew not a red flag but the union at his main-truck. There was, nevertheless, a popular superstition, which was even shared in high quarters, to the effect that the rank of admiral of the red had existed at some previous time, and had been abolished, owing to an admiral of the red having been taken by the enemy. There was no ground for this superstition; yet it was so firmly rooted all through the eighteenth century, that when early in the nineteenth century admirals of the red were first established, the event was officially chronicled as a "restoration" of the rank to the Navy. Sir George Ayscue, who was taken by the Dutch in 1666, and with whom the fable appears to have been generally associated, was admiral not of the red but of the white squadron.


Aids to  
Navigation.

The conditions under which voyages were made greatly improved. Hadley's quadrant, an account of which was first made public in 1731, soon afterwards came into general use; marine surveying made notable strides: and lighting and buoying were much extended. "The Whole Art of Navigation," by Captain Daniel Newhouse (1727), and the "Mariner's New Kalendar," by Nathaniel Colson (1746), and the earliest of Harrison's timekeepers (1726-58), prepared the way for a new era in navigation. The Nore (1731) and the Dudgeon (1736) lightships were the first vessels of their kind to be moored off the English coasts; and the light on the far-off and dangerous Skerries dates from 1730.

Naval  
Voyages.

The voyages and discoveries prosecuted by naval officers in men-of-war were of some importance. At the head of all ranks the voyage of Commodore George (afterwards Lord) Anson, who, on September 18th, 1740, sailed from England for the South Seas with the *Centurion*, 50; the *Gloucester*, 50, Captain Richard Norris: the *Severn*, 50, Captain the

Hon. Edward Legge; the *Pearl*, 40, Captain Matthew Michell; the *Wager*, 28, Captain Dandy Kidd; the *Trial*, 8, Commander the Hon. George Murray (afterwards Lord Elibank), and the pinks *Anna* and *Industry*; of which the *Centurion* only made the whole voyage, four of the others being lost or destroyed, and three returning prematurely. Some account of the voyage is given in a subsequent section (p. 292 *seq.*).



MODEL OF THE ORIGINAL NORE LIGHTSHIP.

(By permission of the Elder Brethren, Trinity House.)

The squadron met with terrible calamities, but the profits of the voyage were immense, for a great number of most valuable Spanish prizes were made, one vessel alone having a cargo worth £400,000.

Polar exploration, and especially the search for a North-West Passage, also received some attention from naval officers. In 1741 Commander Christopher Middleton, who, before joining the Navy, had been in the Hudson's Bay Company's

Arctic Ex-  
ploration.

service, was given direction of a little expedition composed of two sloops-of-war, but he did not get further north than 60° 30'. In 1745 an Act was passed offering a premium of £20,000 for the discovery and making of the Passage by any British subject, and subsequently other expeditions were fitted out, but the results of them were, upon the whole, disappointing.

Suppression of the Buccaneers.

The West Indies, far into the Georgian era, were still terrorised by those buccaneers or pirates whose origin and history will be recounted in the next section. It may be mentioned here in connection with the work of the Navy during the period that the Government of George I. adopted energetic measures against these freebooters, whose operations paralysed trade and turned many of the smaller islands into mere robber fastnesses. In 1717 a proclamation was issued offering a pardon to all such pirates as should surrender within twelve months for piracies committed anterior to the beginning of that year; and when the period of grace had expired, a reward was offered to any of his Majesty's officers who, by land or sea, should take a pirate and bring about his legal conviction. These measures produced some good results. The activity of Woodes Rogers (p. 42), as governor of the Bahamas, produced others. Yet, both on the coast of Africa and in the West Indies, the evil continued to flourish, the boldest and most noteworthy of the pirates being a man named Roberts, who disposed of three ships—one of 40, one of 32, and one of 24 guns—all of which flew the black flag, and were manned by cut-throats of the worst class. The fall of this scoundrel and his associates was brought about in 1722 by the bravery and ingenuity of Captain (afterwards Admiral of the Fleet Sir) Chaloner Ogle. Cruising off Cape Lopez in the *Swallow*, 46, Captain Ogle learnt that Roberts, with the whole of his flotilla, was lying in a neighbouring bay. The *Swallow* was thereupon disguised, and stood in. The pirates took her for a merchantman, and one of them, slipping her cable, gave chase. Ogle led her well out to sea, shortened sail, tacked, brought her to action, and, after an hour and a half's fight, took her. The gallant officer then returned to the bay with the black flag hoisted above the British ensign. The pirates came out

to meet, as they believed, their fortunate companion and to congratulate him; but, as soon as they were alongside the *Swallow*, Ogle threw off the deception, and furiously engaged both. Roberts and many of his people were killed, and in two hours the two ships struck. Ogle took them to Cape Coast Castle. Seventy-four of the one hundred and sixty prisoners were capitally convicted, and of these fifty-two were executed and hanged in chains on the coast. Ogle was knighted for this exploit.

THE four generations that followed the outbreak of the great Civil War in England were not interested in the same way as their immediate forerunners had been in the expansion of England. That is, they were far more busy in occupying ground already discovered and touched upon than in opening up new fields: discovery and exploration have become altogether secondary to colonisation. The adventurers of the sixteenth century, for the most part, became the buccaneers of the seventeenth; there are no fresh discoveries of great value, such as those of Drake, Frobisher, Jenkinson, Baffin, or Hudson in earlier time; and there are no evidences of the expansion of England so clearly marked or so momentous as the beginnings of our American colonies in 1585, or our Indian dominion in 1601. Yet the general progress of English trade, commerce, maritime activity, and colonisation is undeniable: surer, perhaps, and steadier, though less brilliant than before; it is now that England clearly distances all her rivals, on the sea and in the new world to East and West—even the latest and most obstinate, the French and the Dutch.

**CHARLES  
RAYMOND  
BEAZLEY.**  
Explora-  
tion,  
1642-1742.


The Buccaneers, in the sense of Dampier's age, were first organised from the pirate volunteers of Elizabeth's time, when, early in the seventeenth century, the Spaniards abandoned the mines of St. Domingo, and the island was taken possession of by French wanderers, who had been driven out of St. Kitts. Later on, the freebooters' capital was moved to the hilly and thickly wooded island of Tortuga, which they thoroughly subdued. They hunted wild bulls, each man with his musket and dogs, returning (Exquemelin tells us) after

**The Buc-  
caneers.**

expeditions lasting "the space of a year or two," to "refit and divide the spoil." Their cattle-hides they sold to the Dutch traders of the West Indies; their servants or slaves were

often unfortunates, like Exquemelin himself, decoyed from Europe, and induced or forced to bind themselves for a term of years<sup>1</sup>—besides those "slaves natural," whom they captured from among the coloured races of various shades.

The Spaniards were inflexible in their exclusive policy; and their attempt to treat every foreigner on the coast of the American Continent as a smuggler or a robber was the ultimate reason of the buccaneering league among the more adventurous and desperate mariners of other European



BARTHOLOMEW PORTUGUES.

(Exquemelin, "Ducaneers of America," 1684.)

nations, who from cattle hunters gradually became pirates. At first these privateers made their cruises in open boats, and captured by boarding, attacking indiscriminately all promising ships, especially the homeward-bound vessels of Spain. They posed as avengers of the Mexicans and Indians on Spanish cruelty, and, it was said, never embarked, at least in their earlier time, without offering up prayers for success, "nor ever returned with spoil without thanks for the same." On these voyages everyone had a fixed allowance of food and arms, and the plunder was carefully divided according to merit and rank, after provision had first been made for the wounded. "Thus they order for the loss of a right arm 600 pieces of eight or 6 slaves": other wounds were in proportion. By right the captain or commander could only

<sup>1</sup> The English (says Exquemelin) are especially bad at this kidnapping. They bind their servants for seven years full, and sell their persons for debts above twenty-five shillings.

claim one share of the plunder, but if his leading had been brilliant, he was generally rewarded by several additional grants.

The chief buccaneer leaders were, first, among foreign captains, Pierre le Grand, whose successes made the planters of Tortuga turn pirates; Pierre François; Bartholomew Portugues; Roche Brasiliano; François Lolanois; and Mansvelt, who attacked Granada, and reached the Pacific; and secondly, among English or British, Lewis Scot, "who gave a beginning to the invasions by land"; John Davis, the captor of Nicaragua; and the most famous of all, Sir Henry Morgan. This man, the son of a rich yeoman farmer in Wales, first saw service in Barbadoes and Jamaica, and became an important buccaneer through the patronage of old Mansveldt. After many smaller exploits, he carried out a grand attack upon Panama, in 1670: and this expedition reopened the English way to the great Southern Sea, where the buccaneers laid afresh a foundation for much of our geographical knowledge of the Pacific, though Anson and later travelers often complain of the looseness or falsity of their statements.

Sir Henry  
Morgan.

He crossed the isthmus from the mouth of the river Chagres in only ten days, routed the Spaniards before Panama, and sacked the town. After a visit to England, he was sent out again in December, 1674, as Colonel and Lieutenant-Governor of Jamaica, and at the same time knighted. As second in command



SIR HENRY MORGAN.  
(From a contemporary print.)

to Lord Vaughan, the State Papers contain many references to the old buccaneer's stubbornly insubordinate conduct. His old habits were still strong in him, though his hand was now often turned against the privateers. He died in 1688, without



having made any distinct addition to our exploration of the world, but not without having played a part in our conquest of the seas, and of the lands beyond in which the new empire was growing up.

British  
Exploration,  
1642-1680.

Apart from buccaneering ventures, there is very little to say of Englishmen in the unknown or half-known belt of the world from the outbreak of the Civil War under Charles I. to the first voyage of William Dampier (1680). But in 1670-71



*Photo: Walker & Cockerell.*

CAPTAIN WILLIAM DAMPIER, R.N., BY THOMAS MURRAY.

*(National Portrait Gallery.)*

Sir John Narborough navigated the Straits of Magellan and the coasts of Patagonia and Chili, of which he gave an account to Charles II. (Vol IV., p. 518). In 1679-80 some 300 English buccaneers started in Morgan's track to cross the isthmus from the Atlantic side. They formed an alliance with the Darien Indians, who furnished them with canoes upon the Pacific. Some of them remained a long time in the South Sea, and made discoveries or re-discoveries of islands lying off the West American coast as far south as Juan Fernandez;

their daring and success produced the state of things noticed by Dampier, in 1685, when "the Isthmus of Darien was becoming a common road for privateers to pass between the North and South Seas at their pleasure."

With these pirates of 1680 William Dampier made his first important venture. Born in 1652, he had first gone to sea in 1668, but, disgusted by the hardships of a voyage to Newfoundland, he nearly relapsed into a landsman. However, he recovered himself in an East Indian voyage to Bantam, and from 1674 his lot was cast for a time in the West

Dampier.



THE ISTHMUS OF PANAMA.

(From Dampier's "Voyages," 1697.)


Indies. From 1676-8 he lived with the logwood cutters of Campeachy Bay, and now, in 1680, he was buccaneering on the Pacific coast. In 1681 he returned to the isthmus, and recrossed it in a march of some hardship, more hazard, and most slow progress through ground still practically unknown except to Indians. For another year Dampier cruised in the West Indies with pirates "on the account," and, in July, 1682, we find him in Virginia. Here he stayed till August, 1683, when he joined another freebooting adventure, which he himself represents as a voyage of discovery, under Captain John Cooke, who had been in the Pacific

The  
Voyage of  
Dampier  
and  
Cooke.

expedition of 1680, and who now, shipping an English pilot named Cowley, gave out on the first day's sail his mission as trade, and his destination St. Domingo; on the second, piracy his object and Guinea his market. After capturing a better ship at Sierra Leone, the adventurers resumed their original design, and, doubling Cape Horn, reached Juan Fernandez. There they were joined by John Eaton in the *Nicholas*. Learning from three flour ships they took that the Spaniards were on their guard, they abandoned their first plan of attacking the coast of Peru, and sailed with their prizes to the Galapagos or Tortoise Islands (May 31st, 1684). Thence sailing north, they sighted the Mexican coast at the beginning of July, and with other ships (in all, a fleet of ten sail and 1,000 men) ravaged South America for the next twelve months. But, on August 27th, 1685, Swan in the *Cygnet*, parted from Davis, Cooke's successor in the command, who resolved to stay on the coast of Peru, and Dampier elected to go with the former, who proposed first to visit Mexico and then to cross the Pacific. Presuming upon the gross Spanish ignorance of sea affairs, Swan and Dampier hoped to reap a rich harvest; but as it had been found off Peru and Chili, so now still more in Mexico the privateers were foiled, through the inland trade (by mules and carriages) having to a large extent taken the place of the old coasting commerce.

Wearied at last of waiting for the treasure-ships that never came—rich, helplessly navigated, without small fire-arms, under ignorant Spanish captains, with treacherous Indian seamen, such as they had learned to make their prey in the West Indies—Swan and Dampier left the American coast on the 31st March, 1686, on their way to the first piece of original discovery—in the Australian seas—that had been made by any Englishman for some time. They reached Guam, in the Ladrões, after a voyage of 6,000 miles, in seven weeks, having but three days' provisions left, and the men having begun to talk of eating the "lusty and fleshy" Swan when the rations were exhausted.

The immense breadth of the Pacific suggested to Dampier various reflections upon the errors of ordinary maps in computing the various ocean tracts and in measuring degrees,



(From Dampier's "Voyages," 1697.)

especially between Africa and the East Indies. On the other hand, very old superstitions cropped up among some of the crew, who feared that, in this almost interminable voyage they would be "carried out of the world."

From the Ladrões they followed the track of the sixteenth-century circumnavigators to the Philippines. But after half a year's unsuspecting enjoyment of Mindanaoan hospitality, pressed by the natives, who had poisoned some of their number, they mutinied against Swan, who, with thirty-six of his men, was left on shore. The rest of the crew, electing as captain one John Read, who had led the mutiny, "a pretty ingenious young man, also accounted an artist," now "went," as Dampier puts it, "upon new projects," sailing first towards Cape Comorin. They were frightened by stormy weather from cruising, as at first intended, off Manilla and the coast of China: in the same way they gave up a plan of privateering in the Red Sea, and, after wandering about among the Clove islands, with their "shy turtles," "vast cockles," and "milk-white crockadores" (cockatoos), fell in with New Holland or Australia, in S. Lat. 16° 50', on January 4th, 1688.<sup>1</sup>


Dampier  
in Aus-  
tralia.

While off New Holland Dampier claims that he urged the "mad pickle crew of the *Cygnēt*" to go to some English factory, or at least to return and rescue Swan, but they threatened to maroon him; and, leaving New Holland on March 12th, 1688, cruised aimlessly about for two months longer. Just after crossing the line, at the end of April, Read caught and scuttled a native proa "not for the lucre, but to hinder from going ashore." In the Nicobars, however, which were sighted on May 4th, Dampier escaped, or rather, parted company.<sup>2</sup> He had only gone so far "knowing that the further we went the more knowledge and experience I should get, which was the main thing I regarded": now he was determined to return to settled life. With seven others

<sup>1</sup> This part of the cruise suggested to Dampier some of his most valuable remarks on the deep seas so often found near high lands, on the want of harbours in lofty, rocky coasts, and the need of level bottoms for anchorages. Further, his account of New Holland was the best English description so far of what was from our side a new discovery.

<sup>2</sup> The *Cygnēt* went on to Madagascar, then a great centre of piracy (*cf.* Kidd's story), and "now lies sunk in St. Augustine's Bay" there.

(four of them the Malays from the proa lately scuttled, who had been put ashore with him), he started for Sumatra, and, after an adventurous canoe voyage, came in five days to the coast of Achin, (15th to 19th May, 1688). Hence Dampier made his way to Bencoolen factory, where he entered the service of the East India Company. He was disgusted with the conduct of the officials, and "not thinking himself safe under men so brutish and barbarous" as some of them, returned to England, by the Cape of Good Hope, in 1691. He arrived in the Downs on the 16th September of that



DAMPIER'S PASSAGE AND SHARKS' BAY,  
N.W. AUSTRALIA.

(From Dampier's "Voyages," 1697.)

year; and Evelyn mentions in his "Diary" the Menangis islander, whom the reclaimed buccaneer tried to exhibit as an Indian Prince.

For the next six years we have no more news of him, but in 1697 he published his "Voyage Round the World," with a dedication to Charles Montague, the President of the Royal Society. In 1699 an additional volume gave an account of his stay in India, and of his shorter voyages to Tonquin, Madras, and other places, with a dedication to the First Lord of the Admiralty, Orford, to whom Dampier was recommended by Montague for the command of an exploring voyage.

Dampier's  
Second  
Voyage to  
Australia.

The offer was accepted, and the "Terra Australis" fixed as the object of exploration, at Dampier's own suggestion. In command of the sloop of war *Roebuck*, he sailed on the 14th January, 1698-9. Going out by the African route, he sighted New Holland on the 26th July, explored a good deal of its north-west coast, and surveyed Sharks' Bay, where he made a lengthened stay to examine the country. He also explored and named after himself a small archipelago between North-West Cape and the Rowley Shoals, coasting the north of New Guinea, and the north, east, and south of "New Britain," and gave his name to the straits which separate these two islands. It was left for Carteret, in 1767, to complete this survey, by the discovery that St. George's Bay, in "New Britain," was really a channel, dividing the island into two, New Britain and New Ireland.

Between the 7th and 14th August Dampier lay in Sharks' Bay, where he sighted and named the kangaroo, whose tracks, "like those of a mastiff," he had noted on his previous visit: thence coasting on to the north-east, he found the shore somewhat bolder, fringed by many rocky islands. From the strong tides here met with, Dampier, like earlier adventurers in the North-West Passage, fancied there was at this point a way between the lands, to the south of New Holland and New Guinea, into the great South Sea eastward. This he thought of trying further on his return from New Guinea, but gave it up for want of water, a standing trouble in this "archipelago of isles."

As no water could be found, the explorers, in the beginning of September, left Australia for Timor, and after a stay to recruit, set out again, threading their way among the islands to the North-West of Australia, correcting various errors in the common charts. On New Year's Day, 1700, they first descried the coast of New Guinea—high land, well clothed with fine, tall, green trees—at a point nearly opposite to Amboyna. On the 4th February Dampier was off Cape Mabo, the extreme north-west point of New Guinea, on the 14th he rounded the Papuan "Good Hope," at the end of a strait now called after himself; and on the 16th, re-crossing the line, the *Roebuck* passed out of sight of land till, with Wishart's Island, those tracts were reached that were then

New  
Guinea.

named in common New Britain, and before this time had been supposed to be all one with New Guinea.

Passing along the eastern coast of this island, and by the opening, called by Dampier St. George's Bay, which really divided New Britain and New Ireland, as they were called later, the discoverer came at last (March 9th to 31st) to his most important achievement, the strait between New Guinea and the land to the north-east, named after himself

"Dampier  
Passage."



COSTUME OF NATIVE CALIFORNIAN WOMEN.

(Woodes Rogers, "Cruising Voyages Round the World," 1709-1711.)

Dampier's Passage. It was now that he gave the name of Nova Britannia to this "East land not joining to New Guinea."

Dampier returned upon his course along the northern coast of New Guinea, sighting and naming various small islands, of which the volcanic "Burning Island," a little to the north-west of the New Britain "Passage," was the most remarkable: and with this his exploration practically ended.

Reappearing in England, in 1701, he was condemned by court-martial, 8th June, 1702, for his treatment of a lieutenant, and pronounced unfit for his command. Yet, on the 16th April, 1703, he was commissioned for a fresh voyage,



Dampier's  
Last  
Voyage.

on which he started on September 11th of the same year, and which became famous for the marooning of Alexander Selkirk on Juan Fernandez. But Dampier only sailed as far as the Peruvian coast; the circumnavigation was performed by his colleague and bitter enemy, William Funnell, and the disastrous results of the voyage made shipowners refuse to entrust him with another expedition. In his last voyage, with Captain Woodes Rogers, in the *Duke and Duchess* (1708-11), he sailed as pilot. Starting in August, 1708, this expedition, the one financial success in which Dampier was ever concerned as a seaman—for his fame was more due to his authorship than to his power of command—returned in October, 1711, with £200,000 worth of spoil. It was on this journey that Alexander Selkirk, the original of Robinson Crusoe, was rescued from Juan Fernandez, where he had been four years and four months (February 1st, 1709). Afterwards the adventurers took and ransomed Guayaquil along with thirteen prizes, holding it till a ransom was paid, and then visited the Galapagos. On the 22nd December they captured the Manilla treasure galleon, and immediately after started for the Ladrões, across the Pacific. Passing these on the 10th March, 1710, they reached England October 11th, 1711.

After this we hear no more of Dampier as an explorer. He died in March, 1714-5, the most representative figure in the history of our discovery and travel between the great Civil War and the coming of the Hanoverians, and especially remarkable for his skill in observing and recording natural phenomena. It was as the great explorer of the time in the region of the actual that Swift makes his discoverer of the fantastic worlds of Lilliput and Brobdingnag, Captain Lemuel Gulliver, hail Dampier as cousin.

Other Ex-  
plorations.

Of the other ocean voyages of this period, that of Cowley, who claimed to have made the first English discovery and description of the Galapagos or Tortoise Islands, off the coast of Ecuador, is the same as that of Dampier, in 1683, up to the parting of Davis and Swan. When the privateer fleet separated, Cowley went with Captain Eaton, crossed the Pacific with him from the Peruvian coast to Guam in the Ladrões, a run of "7,646 miles," and completed the circumnavigation by way of Canton and the East Indies till he got

disgusted with the mutinous condition of the crew, and left the ship. He finished the voyage home, from Batavia to the Cape, and from the Cape to England, in a Dutch vessel. The career of Edward Davis, after his separation from Swan and Dampier, is known to us from the account of his surgeon, Lionel Wafer. He sacked Arica: felt, in 1687, at 150 leagues from land, the shock of the earthquake that overthrew Lima, and returned by Cape Horn to the West Indies and Virginia. He reappears in 1702, but only as a privateer in the Atlantic.

Of other maritime expeditions leading to any sort of discovery and exploration we have a remarkable dearth. Adventures such as those of Everard in Madagascar and the East, and voyages such as that of William Kidd, are pretty well all we have left to notice on this side; though a word may be added on overland travel, and on the progress of the American colonies.


The apology so long offered for privateering, that had it not been for these lawless adventurers, the practice of exclusive charters to trading companies would have put an end to all discoveries, "and so extinguish that spirit, which is the life and soul of Navigation," was getting rather stale by the end of the seventeenth century, and it was to suppress all such irregular ventures that William Kidd was sent from Plymouth, in May, 1696. At first, when cruising off New York, he was considered a public benefactor, and was voted a present of £250 by the grateful colonists. He now seems to have formed his plan. Shipping ninety-five ruffians as an addition to his crew, and thus raising his complement to 155, he announced that the "trusty and well-beloved Captain Kidd, commander of the ship *Adventure Galley*," was off to Madagascar to chase the pirates. On the voyage he showed himself in his true colours. In 1698-9 rumours got abroad that Kidd had turned pirate himself. He returned to the American coast laden, it was said, with more spoil than had ever fallen to a single captain, and, disembarking at Long Island, was supposed to have buried a quantity of gold, silver, and precious stones. With a mysterious recklessness he then dismissed his crew, and appeared in Boston streets in the dress of a gentleman of leisure. Bellamont,

Captain  
Kidd.

Governor of New York, met him, caused his arrest (July, 1699), and sent him to England for trial. He was condemned, and hanged at Execution Dock on May 23rd, 1701.

Clipperton and Shelvoeke.

A subsequent privateering expedition of a somewhat Dampieresque character is that of John Clipperton and George Shelvoeke (1719-21). They were sent out with two ships in February, 1719, on a nautical enterprise against the Spaniards, under commission from the Emperor. The ships soon parted company, and Clipperton, after some plundering on the west coast of South America, crossed the Pacific,



INHABITANTS OF THE DANUBIAN COUNTRIES.

(From the "Travels of Edward Browne," 1685.)

and after nearly losing his ship at Guam at last reached Amoy, where the vessel was condemned and sold. Shelvoeke was even less fortunate. He sacked Payta, and was then shipwrecked at Juan Fernandez, but escaped with his crew and captured a Spanish prize. He visited California, crossed the Pacific to China, and made his way home in February, 1721, *via* the Cape of Good Hope. William Betagh, Shelvoeke's captain of marines, was taken prisoner by the Spaniards, and has left an interesting narrative of his experiences in Peru. The account of Anson's voyages must be deferred to a later section (p. 292 *seq.*).

Travel  
by Land.

In the way of overland travel, putting aside such journeys as those of Burnet and Viceroy, which were entirely confined to Western Europe, we may note, as rather more of the nature of exploration, the travels of Edward Browne, son of Sir Thomas Browne, of Norwich, of "Religio Medici" fame, in Bohemia, Moravia, Hungary, and the Balkan Peninsula, in 1668-9, and of Henry Maundrell in Syria, in 1696; but the bare mention of the scope of these journeys proves that English enterprise at this time was not stirring in such out-of-the-way quarters of the globe as in the time of Anthony Jenkinson (Vol. III., pp. 325, 665 *seq.*). Perhaps the most

extensive and interesting of all the overland travels of these later years are those of De la Motraye "through Europe, Asia, and into part of Africa" (1710, 1711, 1712, etc.), containing an unusually full and intelligent account of all the countries included in the Ottoman Empire, with notices of lands as far distant as Lapland and Central Russia. Though of French origin, Motraye seems to have become to all intents and purposes a naturalised Englishman.



JOHN ELIOT, THE APOSTLE OF THE INDIANS.

Lastly, in North America, the lion's share of discovery and exploration in this period falls not to us, but to the French. Yet missionaries, such as John Eliot, who began his preaching in 1646, did something for the better knowledge of the Indian lands at the back of Massachusetts; and the grant of Carolina, in 1663, had a somewhat similar effect southwards. So too Penn's Colony, of 1682—Pennsylvania—and "King William's war," of 1689-97, with the French, widened the area of English influence and knowledge. Of still greater interest is the settlement of Georgia (1732) by

The  
American  
Colonies,  
1688-1742.

General James Oglethorpe, as a refuge for deserving persons who had fallen into adversity at home. Only an allusion can be made here to this philanthropic enterprise—its excellent

## THE Quakers Farewel to England, O R

Their Voyage to New *Ferfey*, fciuate on the Continent of *Virginia*,  
and bordering upon *New England*.

*To the Tune of, The Independents Voyage to New England:*

Come Friends let's away,  
Since our *Tia* and *Noy*  
In *England* is now lighted,  
To the *Indians* we'll goe,  
And our *Legbs* to them throw,  
That they be no longer bighted.  
We'll teach them to *Quake*,  
And vry Mouthes to make,  
And preend *Inspiration*;  
That the *Profits* that are there  
Shall readly fwee,  
We will up the Gods of their *Nation*.  
For each *FRITAZIER*  
Is inspired there  
When the *Spirit* into him does enter,  
And turns up his *Eyes*,  
And trembles likewise  
A Spark without peradventure.  
Yes the *Worlds* People  
That warships at the *Steeple*,  
Will confidently aver it,  
(Though it be a thing unvail)  
That it is the *Devil*  
That both of us call the *Spirit*.  
Yet be it what it will  
So we get our fill  
Of *Riches*, and good *positions*,  
When occasion shall be,  
We can change, yps shall see,  
Both *Habits* and our *Professions*.  
The *Country* is good,  
There's no want of *Food*;  
'Tis fit for the *Righteous* to live in,  
Nor need *Sisters* fear,  
But this *Country* Cheere  
Will make them plump and thriving.  
For 'tis very meete  
That such should well eate,  
And further *Propagation*,  
Or else *ISRAEL'S* Race  
Will deny apace,  
And leave us a mock to the *Nation*.  
There shall we be free,  
And enjoy *LIBERTIE*,  
No power our Will controules,  
Then what greater *Bliss*  
Could any of us wish,  
Or desire from our *very* doubts?  
With the *POPE* and the *TYRKE*  
We before made no work;  
But if *Emberpaw* comes next us,

We'll let them both know,  
That power we have now  
Shall make them to *Quake* and fear us.  
Neither *IVES* nor *RICKS*  
With all their *Tricks*  
Shall baffle our *Inspiration*;  
We'll make them to bend  
If they dare here contend,  
And come to a *Recantation*.  
These *BARBISTS*, Alas!  
Had a very bad *Cafe*  
To prove no *Christiandity*  
In *Quakers* is found,  
Since we have good ground  
For what we pretend to be.  
Then why do we stay,  
And make such delay,  
(When we to a *Canaan* are going)  
For who stays behind,  
May afterwards find,  
That it may cause their undoing.  
They have proved already  
Our *Faith* is not *steady*;  
Therefore we no *Christians* can be,  
Then next they will prove,  
(If we do not remove)  
Us guilty of *Heresie*.  
Then will they perpeke  
And the *Onward* Man vex;  
We shall have no peace in our *Quintets*;  
But if we get away,  
The *INFORMERS* may  
Go hang themselves in their own *Garters*;  
In this *Land* we can live,  
Get *Money* and thrive,  
And follow our own *Inventions*  
In spite of all those  
That seek to oppose  
Our *Zem*, or its *pretensions*.  
To New *FERRER* with speed  
Come all *Friends* that need  
Wealth, or large *Positions*;  
The *Indians* we'll make  
To serve us and *Quake*,  
And be *Slaves* to our *Professions*,  
What they have is our own!  
As plainly shall be shown;  
For before us, *Israels* Race  
The *Canaanites* did spoyle,  
And make them *turmoyle*.  
For them in their own place.

London, Printed for J. G. 1675.

Guth & Co. Boston.

THE QUAKER EMIGRATION TO AMERICA.

(Bagford Ballads.)

relations with the Indians, its exclusion of slavery and of intoxicants, and its successful repulse of the Spanish attack from Florida. We may note, too, the various attempts at settlement in Louisiana and in the Isthmus of Darien. But

in this direction all effort was closed by the failure of William Paterson's Darien Scheme (1695-1700). Intended to open up a new trade route to the Far East in rivalry with the English East India Company and in retaliation for the injury inflicted on Scottish commerce by the Navigation Laws, it was ill-planned and worse executed, and ended in nothing but disaster.

FROM the date of the Revolution the history of legal innovation becomes more and more a history of statutes. The Revolution restored unity and energy to the legislature, by subordinating the Crown to the Parliament. It put an end to the long intervals between parliament and parliament, and between session and session. It rendered almost impossible the abrupt prorogations and dissolutions of the seventeenth century. It made the sovereign and his ministers anxious to comply with the wishes of the nation to expedite business and to obtain by popular arts a liberal supply. It virtually deprived the sovereign of his right to reject bills which had passed both Houses. This right was indeed exercised several times by William with reference to measures of grave consequence, but it was only once exercised by Anne, and has never been exercised since her death. Since the Revolution Parliament has met every year, and has sat for a considerable time. The deliberate wishes of Parliament have, since the Revolution, encountered no serious opposition. Ample opportunity has thus been afforded for all the legislation demanded by public opinion, and direct legislation has thus become the normal means of altering the law. Judicial decision continues indeed to be a potent agency of improvement, but it is used rather to define and apply principles already acknowledged than to introduce principles altogether novel.

It is true that, except in the province of constitutional law, few important changes were effected by statute in the reigns of William, of Anne, and of George I. A few statutes may be cited for their antiquarian interest or for their relation to the general history of the time. Thus the abolition of the Court of the Marches of Wales, founded by Henry VIII., effaced the last vestige of a time when Wales was still imperfectly subdued, and an extraordinary jurisdiction

F. C.  
MONTAGUE.  
English Law  
1689-1742.

The Effect  
of the  
Revolution.

The Progress  
of Statute  
Law.



A COMMONS' COMMITTEE ON THE FLEET PRISON, 1729, BY HOGARTH.  
(*National Portrait Gallery.*)

had been required to keep it in order. The extension of benefit of clergy to women in the case of those felonies in which it had hitherto been enjoyed by men, marks the completion of a long process by which benefit of clergy, once available only to clerks, and then extended to all who could read, finally came to lose all reference to the clerical profession. The right of the owner of personal property to bequeath it as he saw fit was established throughout England. Hitherto in the ecclesiastical province of York and in



THE SHERIFFS' COURT IN 1709.

(From a Table of Fines issued by the Court.)

the city of London custom had given the widow and children of the deceased an indefeasible right to a certain proportion of his personal estate. This custom was now abrogated in the northern province by a statute of 1692, and in London by a statute of 1724. Merchants and traders were benefited by the Act of William III., which enabled them to agree that a reference to arbitration should be made a rule of court, so that the arbitrator's decision should be binding on both parties; and by the Act of Anne, which conferred upon promissory notes the character of negotiable instruments.



The first serious attempt since the Reformation to ensure an adequate maintenance for the inferior clergy was made by the Act of Anne, which constituted the first-fruits and tenths hitherto received by the Crown into a fund for the augmentation of the poorest livings. The prevalence of gambling in this period is indicated by a severe Act of the same reign, which rendered void securities of every kind given for money lost in games or in betting on the players, or knowingly advanced for such purposes.

**Reform of  
Trials for  
Treason.**


A more serious interest is awakened by the Act for regulating trials in cases of treason and misprision of treason; for this Act is memorable, not only in the history of the Constitution, but also in the history of English criminal procedure. In trials for treason and felony—that is to say, in all capital causes—the common law placed the accused at a grave disadvantage. Kept in confinement until the day of his trial, he had no right to see his indictment, to be informed what witnesses would depose against him, or to confer with professional lawyers as to his defence. At the trial his witnesses were not examined upon oath as were the witnesses for the Crown. He was forced to make his own defence, although he was allowed to have a legal adviser at his side. Thus at a moment's notice, and under the apprehension of a shameful death, without legal learning, without practice in cross-examining, without training in advocacy, the miserable wretch had to contend against an indictment cunningly framed, against evidence rendered impressive by an oath, and against prosecutors whose lives were spent in constant forensic exercise. Persons accused of treason were in a position of peculiar hardship. For the judge was almost always prejudiced in favour of the Crown, the jury was too often packed by the sheriff, and the prosecuting counsel might hope to make their own careers by securing a conviction. In the numerous trials for treason which took place between the Restoration and the Revolution, the inherent vices of the procedure were so much aggravated by the servility and brutality of the bench, as to call forth a demand for reform, especially among the Whigs, who had been the greatest sufferers. Accordingly, a bill for regulating trials in case of treason was introduced in 1691, but was

lost, partly because the Whigs, who were now in power, no longer cared to blunt the weapons of the Government; and partly because the Lords desired a larger measure of protection for their own order than the Commons cared to concede. It was not until 1695 that the bill, brought in again and again, became law (7 William III., c. 3.). It provided that a person accused of treason should have a copy of the indictment at least five days, and a copy of the panel of jurors at least two days, before trial. It gave him the right to take legal advice, to make his defence by counsel, to have his witnesses examined upon oath, and to compel their attendance by the process already available with respect to witnesses for the Crown. Two witnesses were already required, by a statute of Edward VI., for conviction on a charge of treason. The statute of William III. added that both witnesses must testify to the same overt act of treason, or one of them to one and the other to another act of the same treason. Except on the charge of attempting to assassinate the king, no person was to be indicted for treason unless within three years of the alleged offence. Finally, this Act conceded the demand of the Peers, that on the trial of a peer or peeress for treason a summons should be sent, not, as formerly, to a small number of peers selected by the Lord High Steward, but to every peer who was entitled to sit and vote. Thus the procedure in trials for treason was rendered rational and humane. Mr. Justice Stephen notes in his "History of the Criminal Law" that the passing of this Act seems to have had very little influence on the fate of accused persons. But it must be remembered that the governments which succeeded the Revolution were usually careful not to incur the odium of unreasonable and unnecessary prosecutions. The procedure in trials for felony remained on the bad old footing. In the course of the eighteenth century it became the custom to allow the accused the help of counsel for every purpose, except that of making the speech for the defence. This right was not conceded until 1836.

The Copyright Act of 1709 is a fitting legal monument of a literary age. Before the invention of printing, comparatively few copies can have been made, even of a successful and popular work. No author lived, or could have hoped to


**The Law  
of Copy-  
right.**

live, upon the profits derived from the sale of his writings. Even after the introduction of printing into England, a hundred years elapsed, it is said, without any legal recognition of copyright. In the seventeenth century, however, the number of readers became so considerable, that the exclusive right of printing and publishing a book might well be worth possessing. Such a right was recognised by the courts of common law. The common law copyright was in so far more valuable than the statutory copyright which authors now enjoy, that it was unlimited in point of duration. But it was practically of little benefit, because it could not be enforced. The party entitled to the copyright could recover damages to the extent of the loss which he could prove, and it was impossible for him to prove the sale of any but a few of the pirated copies. Even these damages he rarely recovered, because the defendant was usually a pauper. Under these circumstances, persons interested in copyright were loud in their complaints. Their petitions were answered by the statute 8 Anne, c. 19, which became the basis of all subsequent legislation. This statute provided that the author of any work printed before the 10th of April, 1710, was to have the exclusive right of publishing for twenty-one years. The author of any work printed after that date was to have the same right for fourteen years, and if he were living at the expiration of that period, the right was to be renewed to him for a similar period. All copies published in contravention of the statute were to be forfeited to the owner of the copyright, who was to reduce them to waste paper. The offending publisher was also to forfeit a penny for every sheet of pirated matter in his possession. Lest any bookseller should be able to plead ignorance as an excuse for breaking the law, the person having copyright was required to record his title in the register book of the Stationers' Company, which was to be open to inspection by the public. In order that booksellers might not demand an unreasonable price for publications in which they had copyright, the Act allowed complaint to be made to the Archbishop of Canterbury, to the Lord Keeper, and to certain other dignitaries, and gave them power to limit the price as, upon inquiry, they should think reasonable. It would be



A COURT OF LAW ABOUT 1733.  
(From a contemporary satirical print.)

live, upon the profits derived from the sale of his writings. Even after the introduction of printing into England, a hundred years elapsed, it is said, without any legal recognition of copyright. In the seventeenth century, however, the number of readers became so considerable, that the exclusive right of printing and publishing a book might well be worth possessing. Such a right was recognised by the courts of common law. The common law copyright was in so far more valuable than the statutory copyright which authors now enjoy, that it was unlimited in point of duration. But it was practically of little benefit, because it could not be enforced. The party entitled to the copyright could recover damages to the extent of the loss which he could prove, and it was impossible for him to prove the sale of any but a few of the pirated copies. Even these damages he rarely recovered, because the defendant was usually a pauper. Under these circumstances, persons interested in copyright were loud in their complaints. Their petitions were answered by the statute 8 Anne, c. 19, which became the basis of all subsequent legislation. This statute provided that the author of any work printed before the 10th of April, 1710, was to have the exclusive right of publishing for twenty-one years. The author of any work printed after that date was to have the same right for fourteen years, and if he were living at the expiration of that period, the right was to be renewed to him for a similar period. All copies published in contravention of the statute were to be forfeited to the owner of the copyright, who was to reduce them to waste paper. The offending publisher was also to forfeit a penny for every sheet of pirated matter in his possession. Lest any bookseller should be able to plead ignorance as an excuse for breaking the law, the person having copyright was required to record his title in the register book of the Stationers' Company, which was to be open to inspection by the public. In order that booksellers might not demand an unreasonable price for publications in which they had copyright, the Act allowed complaint to be made to the Archbishop of Canterbury, to the Lord Keeper, and to certain other dignitaries, and gave them power to limit the price as, upon inquiry, they should think reasonable. It would be



A COURT OF LAW ABOUT 1733.  
(From a contemporary satirical print.)

interesting to know whether advantage was ever taken of this curious provision. Lastly, the Act required nine copies of every new book to be delivered at Stationers' Hall, for the use of certain libraries.<sup>1</sup> For a long time it was supposed that the copyright conferred by the Act of Anne did not affect the perpetual copyright recognised by the common law. But in the case of *Donaldson v. Beckett*, decided in 1774, the House of Lords held that the common law copyright had been altogether abrogated by the Act of Anne. That Act has in turn been repealed by the Act 5 & 6 Victoria, c. 45, which contains the modern law of copyright.

Registra-  
tion of  
Title.

The establishment of the Middlesex and Yorkshire registries of documents affecting the title to land in those counties deserves a brief notice here. The publicity of all dealings with land is so obviously desirable that many attempts have been made to secure it in England. The ancient ceremony known as livery of seisin had, to some extent, secured this object so long as livery of seisin was essential to a conveyance of lands. When the lawyers had contrived to evade the necessity of livery of seisin, an Act of Henry VIII. required every bargain and sale of freehold lands to be enrolled (*i.e.* registered) either in one of the courts of Westminster or in the county where the lands were situated. But ingenious lawyers soon discovered a means of evading this statute, so that transfers of land again became secret, and the bad effects of secrecy were experienced once more. In the seventeenth century the remedy of registration was frequently suggested. Bills for the registration of transactions relating to land were introduced under the Commonwealth, but failed to become law. After the Restoration a committee of the House of Lords reported that the widespread uncertainty of title was a prime cause of the depreciation of landed property, and that this uncertainty might be cured by a system of registration. Registration was again recommended by Chamberlayne, one of the best known projectors and pamphleteers of the time of William III. Under Queen Anne registries were actually established in the East and West Ridings of Yorkshire and in Middlesex.

<sup>1</sup> The Royal library, the libraries of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, the libraries of the Scotch Universities, the library of Sion College, London, and the Advocates' Library, Edinburgh.

These registries were, in technical language, registries of assurances, not of title. In other words, they contained a record, not of the actual owners of the land, but of all transactions affecting the land. An intending purchaser or mortgagee would have found, upon searching them, no direct information as to the person entitled to deal with the estate which attracted him, but a mass of evidence from which he might infer for himself who was the person so entitled. An Act of 1735 established a similar registry of assurances in the North Riding, and an Act of 1884 consolidated and amended the law relating to the Yorkshire registries. But the system of registration devised for Yorkshire and Middlesex in the reign of Anne has never been applied to any other county, and in Middlesex itself has been transformed by recent legislation.

A memorable concession was made to common sense by the Act of the fourth year of George II., which provided that from the 25th of March, 1733, all writs, pleadings, indictments, patents, charters, pardons, etc., and all proceedings in any court of justice in England, should be in the English language only, and not in French or Latin. Two years later the provisions of this Act were declared to apply to all courts in Wales. A concession alike to humanity and to common sense was made by the Act of 1736 repealing the old statutes against witchcraft and forbidding any prosecution to be instituted for that offence. Less interesting, but of some importance to our law of real property, is the Act of 9 George II., c. 36, which avoided any gift to charitable uses of land or of money to be laid out in buying land unless made by a deed executed in presence of witnesses, at least twelve months before the death of the donor, and enrolled in the Court of Chancery within six months of execution. This Act is sometimes termed the Mortmain Act of George II.; but the name is hardly accurate, since its object was not to prevent charitable gifts of land, but to prevent the soliciting of such gifts from men on their deathbed. It was repealed by the Mortmain and Charitable Uses Act of 1888, which has in turn been altered by an Act of 1891. Testamentary gifts of land to charitable uses are now valid, but the land must, as a rule, be sold within a year of the death of the testator.

Other  
Reforms :  
The Lan-  
guage of  
the Law

Repeal of  
the Laws  
on Witch-  
craft.

Mortmain



**T. WHIT-  
TAKER.**  
Philosophy.

WITHIN this period comes the greater part of the deistic controversy already spoken of (IV., p. 777). On the side of the defence there appeared, in 1738, the first volume of Bishop Warburton's "Divine Legation of Moses." The second followed in 1741, but the whole was not published till after Warburton's death (1779). It had been pointed out by the Deists that there is no reference in the legislation of the Pentateuch to a system of rewards and punishments in a future state. Warburton concedes this, and founds on it an argument for the divine origin of the Mosaic legislation. No lawgiver not divinely commissioned, Warburton contends, would have omitted so obvious a means of reinforcing his code. Therefore Moses was divinely commissioned. Warburton's work is one of the most elaborate of the many replies to the Deists, though it is not that which has most permanent interest. Two works of much greater philosophical importance came forth on the orthodox side, namely, Berkeley's "Alciphron" and Butler's "Analogy," both of which were written primarily in answer to the Deists, and to freethinking writers usually classed with them, such as Mandeville.

**Mandeville.**

Bernard de Mandeville (1670-1733) was a native of Rotterdam, but had gained great command of English, which he showed in his "Fable of the Bees," first published in 1705, republished with additions in 1714 and 1723. The second title of the fable—"Private Vices Public Benefits"—indicates the line of argument. Assuming the ascetic view that virtue consists in all kinds of abstinence, vice in indulgence in things superfluous and pursuit of them, Mandeville argues that if vice were to be wholly suppressed in a State, and virtue made to prevail, prosperity would disappear, and the commonwealth sink into poverty and contempt. Men, being naturally vain, have been flattered into virtue by the praise and blame of those who are interested, for their own ends, in promoting the practice of virtue by others. Against these positions some have thought it worth while to argue seriously, while some look upon them as paradoxes from which occasionally real insight may be gained.

**Hutcheson.**

Francis Hutcheson (1694-1746) defended Shaftesbury's principles against Mandeville. In 1725 appeared at Dublin

his first essay, the "Inquiry into the Original of our Ideas of Beauty and Virtue." In 1729 he was elected to the chair of Moral Philosophy in the University of Glasgow. After his death his largest work, "A System of Moral Philosophy" (1755), was published by his son. In metaphysics Hutcheson had some influence in preparing for the "philosophy of



FRANCIS HUTCHESON.

(Glasgow University.)

common sense" but his chief importance is in ethics. From Shaftesbury he adopted the phrase "moral sense." He makes the moral sense completely parallel to the æsthetic sense. By it we judge of actions; but what effectively impels us to virtue is disinterested benevolence. The moral sense approves of that which tends to the general happiness. Bentham's phrase, "the greatest happiness of the greatest number," occurs first in Hutcheson.

Wollaston.

William Wollaston (1659-1724), in "The Religion of Nature Delineated" (1722, 1724), put forth an ethical theory having much in common with Clarke's doctrine about "the fitness of things." That action, he holds, is good which expresses a true proposition. By the recognition of truth, and the expression of it in action, happiness is attained. The intellectualist side of Wollaston's theory is that which is usually dwelt on; but it has been pointed out that his proposal of a "moral arithmetic" anticipates the later utilitarian calculus of pleasures and pains.

Berkeley's  
"Alci-  
phron."

In the "Discourse of Passive Obedience" (1711), which belongs to his first period, Berkeley had already to some extent expressed himself on the general principles of moral philosophy. In "Alciphron, or the Minute Philosopher" (1732), directed specially against the freethinkers of the time, he attacks both Mandeville and Shaftesbury. Against Shaftesbury, the insufficiency for men in general of a merely æsthetic morality without sanctions is insisted on. In support of theism, Berkeley develops the positions of his own philosophy. From the "Theory of Vision" in particular is drawn the argument that the objects of sight are a kind of language by which God speaks to men. The connection of colours with the *data* of touch being, in itself, as completely arbitrary as that of words with things signified, no cause of it can rationally be assigned but the Divine volition, which has conjoined certain ideas uniformly with certain others. In style "Alciphron" is the finest of all Berkeley's works.

Berkeley's  
Later  
Works.

To this period of Berkeley's life belong also "The Analyst" (1734), "The Querist" (1735-7), and "Siris" (1744). Of these the first is a criticism of the fundamental assumptions of the differential calculus. These are found to be, when examined, as mysterious as any theological propositions; and thus the ground is cut away from freethinking mathematicians who imagine that they have in their own science something perfectly clear and self-evident. "The Querist" was suggested by the state of Ireland in Berkeley's time, and is a series of hints towards economic theory. "Siris" represents the latest phase of Berkeley's metaphysical thought. It is, primarily, an argument for the medicinal virtues of tar-water, but proceeds thence to theories of the *anima mundi*, and

finally to the development of a Platonic idealism, not really inconsistent with the doctrine of Berkeley's earlier treatises, but at the same time not deducible from it. It may be best



GEORGE BERKELEY, AFTERWARDS BISHOP OF CLOYNE.

*(By permission of the Provost, Trinity College, Dublin.)*

understood as a development, under the influence of Platonist writers, of the ontology which all along accompanied Berkeley's phenomenalisin, but which was at first left vague.

The works by which Bishop Butler takes philosophic rank

Butler.

are the "Sermons" (1726), preached at the Chapel of the Rolls, and "The Analogy of Religion, Natural and Revealed, to the Constitution and Course of Nature" (1736). Joseph Butler (1692-1752) was born at Wantage, in Berkshire. He became Bishop of Bristol in 1738, of Durham in 1750. At the age of twenty-two he corresponded with Clarke on some positions in Clarke's "Discourse Concerning the Being and Attributes of God." What is most remarkable about Butler's letters is the speculative caution he displays in raising points against Clarke's attempt to establish theism directly from a consideration of the nature of space as an "attribute," of which the subject can only be the Deity.

The argument of Butler's famous "Analogy" is that the moral objections urged against revealed religion are equally applicable to the order of nature. But the Deistic assumption is that the order of nature proceeds from God. Hence the ethical objections of the Deists to the divine character of Christianity in its full sense as a revealed religion, fall to the ground. All that the Christian apologist can fairly be required to prove is that the positive evidences of Christianity suffice to establish its credibility. Butler's argument thus ranges between two quite definite limits. On the one side theism is assumed as ground common to both orthodox and heterodox disputants. On the other side the historical questions about evidences are supposed capable of settlement in favour of those who maintain the supernatural origin of Christianity.

The philosophic originality of Butler's "Sermons" is in ethics. The ground on which he argues is that of psychology. Thus he is to be classed, as regards method, with moralists like Shaftesbury and Hutcheson rather than with moralists like Cudworth and Clarke. In his view of human nature he was distinctly influenced by Shaftesbury. He finds in man affections and passions, self-love and disinterested benevolence, and, above the rest and rightly entitled to rule, though not always furnished with power as it is with right, a principle of reflection, of conscience. Taking from the Stoics the position that virtue consists in "following nature," he finds that to follow nature is to obey neither the passions nor "cool self-love," but conscience. In the history of ethics Butler was chiefly influential by his insistence that among the impulses

of human nature some are disinterested, aiming either directly at objects or at the good of others, and do not consist of self-love in a more or less disguised form. To some extent Hobbes, against whom all the moralists who argued for




JOSEPH BUTLER, BISHOP OF DURHAM.

(By permission of the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Durham.)

primitive benevolent impulses had been contending, is still the opponent in view.

Hume (born in 1711) will be best dealt with at length in the next chapter. The writings by which he was influential in his own time scarcely come at all within this period. His "Treatise of Human Nature," however, was published in Hume.

1739-40; and this is now, by philosophic critics, regarded as being, for matter though not for style, his greatest work. Here he carries forward the criticism of Locke and Berkeley to a complete rejection of all metaphysical ideas of "substance" so far as rational validity is claimed for them. Mind, as well as matter, may be resolved into particular perceptions. No meaning can be attached to the notion of immaterial substance holding perceptions together, any more than to the notion of material substratum. Thus, historically, it is the phenomenalist, and not the ontological, side of Berkeley's doctrine that is carried forward and permanently influences European thought.



MEDAL COMMEMORATING MATTHEW TINDAL THE DEIST.

**T. WHITTAKER.**  
Natural  
Science.

THE history of science in the eighteenth century is for the most part a record of detailed research coming between two periods of great generalisations. Hosts of minor laws are discovered, and new sciences, such as chemistry, practically come into being; but there are no new generalisations equal to those that gave lustre to the seventeenth century; and the way has not yet been prepared for those of the nineteenth century.

**Mathematics.**

In our present period there stand out among the successors of Newton two names of mathematicians—Brook Taylor (1685-1731) and Colin Maclaurin (1698-1746). By his "Methodus Incrementorum Directa et Inversa" (1715) Taylor added a new branch to the higher mathematics, now known as the "calculus of finite differences." This work contained the formula known as "Taylor's theorem," which is of

[1742]

fundamental importance in the differential calculus. To Taylor is due the mathematico-mechanical solution of the problem of vibrating strings—a problem which had already been investigated, on correct principles, by Hooke. Maclaurin, who, as well as Taylor, has given his name to a famous theorem, became Professor of Mathematics at Edinburgh in 1725 on the recommendation of Newton. In 1719 he published "*Geometria organica, sive descriptio linearum curvarum universalis*." His essay on the percussion of bodies obtained the prize of the French Academy of Science in 1724. In 1740 he divided with Euler and Daniel Bernoulli the prize offered by the French Academy of Science for an essay on the flux and reflux of the sea. Berkeley's attack on the principles of the calculus in the "*Analyst*" called forth the "*Treatise on Fluxions*" (1742). Maclaurin seeks to found the whole procedure in clear geometrical demonstrations after the manner of the ancients, and with this object in view, follows Newton's method, regarding fluxions as velocities. In this treatise he gave for the first time the correct method of distinguishing between maxima and minima in general. After his death was published his account of Newton's discoveries (1748).

Neither chemistry nor electricity, so far, is definitely constituted as an independent science; but, in both, observations are being accumulated and conceptions cleared up.

The term "electricity" had been invented by Gilbert, who applied it to the attractions and repulsions which certain bodies, such as amber, when rubbed, exert on light substances. His own work in electricity consisted in verifying and slightly extending the observations of the ancients. Boyle, in a discourse on Electricity in 1676, added new facts. Newton also made many new electrical experiments, and introduced improved apparatus. Francis Hawksbee in 1705 communicated to the Royal Society experiments on the production of light by electrical action. Dr. Wall (1708) compared the spark and crackling sound which he had observed as accompanying the excitation of amber to thunder and lightning. Strictly to our present period belongs Stephen Gray (1696–1736), who discovered, in 1729, that certain bodies have, while others have not, the power of "conducting"



electricity. He repeated and varied the experiments of his contemporary Dufay, by whom the distinction between "vitreous" and "resinous"—or, as they have since been called, "positive" and "negative"—electricity was established. Like Hawksbee and Wall, he recognised the resemblance between artificial electrical phenomena and thunder and lightning.

Boyle's work in chemistry, though, as regards theory, chiefly negative, was important. By his "Sceptical Chemist" (1661) he contributed largely to overthrow what was called "iatro-chemistry," the latest of the pseudo-scientific doctrines that preceded the formation of the science. In the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century two foreign chemists, Becher and Stahl, introduced a theory the distinctive point of which is the assumption that a substance called "phlogiston" is lost by combustible bodies when they burn. This theory, though it was wrong, did service for a considerable time in provisionally connecting the observations made, and was accepted in England. Some of Boyle's experiments, however, had prepared the way for its subsequent disproof; and Hooke, in 1665, foreshadowed the discovery of oxygen, by means of which it was, near the end of the eighteenth century, finally disproved. Newton, in his "Optics" (1704), spoke of the nature and mode of formation of gases. Upon gases Dr. Stephen Hales (1677-1761) gave the result of his observations in "Statical Essays" (1727, 1733). Our atmosphere he regards as a "chaos" consisting partly of "elastic" and partly of "unelastic" air-particles. He showed how "air" could be generated by the distillation of various bodies, but did not investigate the specific properties of each gas. Before the next period, it can hardly be said that anyone has got beyond the tentative stage even of chemical observation.

**D'ARCY  
POWER.  
Medicine  
and Public  
Health.**

THE accession of the House of Hanover to the English throne marks the lowest depth to which modern medicine has descended as a scientific pursuit. There were numerous practitioners of medicine, but they were remarkable for their great wealth, for their high literary culture, or for their eccentricities, rather than for any great scientific advances. Radcliffe and Mead, the two leading physicians of this period,

shone in widely different ways. Radcliffe made a large fortune by the practice of his profession. His memory is kept green by the noble buildings which his benefactions raised at Oxford. Mead, on the other hand, lived splendidly and was the Maecenas of his time. He died a comparatively poor man, and the magnificent library which he had collected was sold. Garth, the poet who buried Dryden, Arbuthnot the wit, and Freind, the great historian of medicine, were his brother practitioners and intimate acquaintances. Medicine, however, had everything to learn. Its methods were as faulty as its treatment. An unbounded faith in authority hampered it, and it had not yet freed itself from the trammels of the humoral pathology. The false science of astrology still existed, and even Mead himself published in 1704 a Latin treatise "Concerning the Influence of the Sun and Moon upon Human Bodies, and the Diseases thereby produced," and of this treatise he issued an English version in 1748.

The surgeons were in an even worse plight than the physicians. They constituted an entirely subordinate order of practitioners, whose practice was largely coerced by the College of Physicians. A surgeon was not allowed to administer remedies for any internal disorder, nor was he permitted to perform any major operation unless a physician was in attendance. The United Company of Barber-Surgeons possessed a monopoly of licensing surgeons to practise in London and within seven miles of the City. This monopoly they were unable to maintain, for the cessation of the war threw out of employment a large number of regimental surgeons who had never served an apprenticeship to the members of the Barber-Surgeons' Company, and who had never been admitted to its freedom. They were, consequently, not legally entitled to practise. They did so, however, and when the Company endeavoured to assert its rights over them, they were often found to have such powerful protectors that it was deemed unwise to push matters to an extreme.

The apothecaries formed a subordinate group of practitioners, corresponding in some respects to the general practitioners of to-day. They were a numerous, powerful, and energetic body, who quarrelled with the College of Physicians, and went near to starving out the superior order,

for they refused to call its members in to consultation and so deprived them of their very means of subsistence.

**Popular  
Credulity.**

The mass of the people during this epoch appear to have been credulous to an extraordinary degree. The densely ignorant lower class, and even the more intelligent and better educated middle class, believed everything that appeared in



CARICATURE OF THOMAS GUY, BY R. GRAVE.

(Caulfield, "Portraits of Remarkable Persons.")

print. This simplicity of belief is well exemplified in the affair of Mary Toft, for in 1727 London was convulsed to know whether this poor and hysterical woman living at Godalming did or did not give birth to rabbits. The incident is commemorated by Hogarth in two plates, one of them lettered "Credulity, Superstition, and Fanaticism."


**Medical  
Charities.**

The opening years of the eighteenth century were not, however, wholly bad. They were marked by a wave of philanthropy which has been of permanent use to the sick

[742]

poor of England—a wave characterised in London by the erection of the General Hospitals of Guy and Westminster, and in the country by the institution of those infirmaries which, established at first for the sole use of the sick and needy, have since become, in many instances, the centres for much that is good in the advancement of medical knowledge. Guy's Hospital was opened 6th January, 1725, "for the relief, by physick or surgery, of sick persons whose illness were of so severe a nature as to lead them to be deemed incurable." The hospital was built in close proximity to, and partly on land owned by, St. Thomas's Hospital. It very rapidly became famous, and it has long held its position as one of the premier hospitals in England. The Westminster Hospital was of humbler origin. It began as a dispensary about 1719, and gradually rose to the dignity, first of a general hospital and then to that of a medical school. Its founders were a body of charitable individuals who had previously made common cause for the relief of sick prisoners confined in Newgate, The Clink, and other prisons of the Metropolis.

Modern medicine may be said to have begun about 1720. It commenced, as was fitting, by a revolution in the methods of



GUY'S HOSPITAL: A PROSPECT OF ONE OF THE WARDS IN 1725.

The Prac-  
tice of  
Medicine.

teaching. There could be no private medical teacher in London so long as the Company of Barber-Surgeons chose to enforce its monopoly of teaching anatomy and surgery, a monopoly conferred upon it by an Act of Parliament passed 24th July, 1540. This Act recites that—

“The . . . maysters or governours of the mistery and comminalltie of barbouris and surgeons of London, and their successours yerely, for ever . . . at their free liberte and pleasure shal and maie have and take without contradiction foure persons condempued, adjudged and put to deathe for feloni by the due order of the Kynges lawe of thys realme, for anatomies . . . and to make incision of the same deade bodies . . . for their further and better knowlage, instruction, insight, learnyng and experience in the said scyence or facultie of surgery.”


The right thus conferred was so jealously guarded that in 1714 Cheselden, the surgeon to St. Thomas's Hospital, who began to lecture in 1711, was summoned before the Company for that “he did frequently procure the Dead bodies of Malefactors from the place of execution, and did dissect the same at his own house.” He promised amendment, “and was excused what had passed with a reproof for the same, pronounced by the Master at the desire of the Court.” There is no doubt that a less influential man than Cheselden would have been fined. His lectures, however, bore good fruit, for about 1730 Edward Nourse, surgeon to St. Bartholomew's Hospital, began to deliver anatomical lectures at London House, in Aldersgate Street, where he then lived, and he employed Percivall Pott, his apprentice, to act as his assistant. Pott, copying his master's example, began to deliver lectures upon surgery at his house in Watling Street about 1747. Sharp, Bromfield, and Nichols. were also lecturing publicly in various parts of London about this time. The Hunters attended these lectures, and from them came the foundation of our modern knowledge.

Public  
Health.

The state of the public health during the first half of the eighteenth century on the whole was good. Plague outbreaks did not occur after the year 1665, though isolated cases of bubonic fever were commonly met with throughout England until the middle of the succeeding century. The place of the plague was taken by a variety of diseases.

1742]

Smallpox, typhus, influenzas, and epidemic agues, dysentery, diarrhœa, and relapsing fevers did their deadly work, and carried off an undue proportion of the population both in towns and in the villages. The material condition of the people of England was greatly improved by the abundant harvests, the low prices, and the heavy exports of corn occurring from 1715 to 1765. The mortality was therefore



WILLIAM CHESELDEN.

(By permission of the Royal College of Surgeons.)

less heavy than it had been in former times, though the bulk of the people still died from what are now called "preventible diseases." Increased prosperity brought with it increased liability to disease. The habits of the people were gross in the extreme, and greater wealth allowed of greater self-indulgence. Drunkenness, says Dr. Creighton in his admirable "History of Epidemics in Britain," was so prevalent that the College of Physicians, on 19th January, 1726, made a representation on the subject to the House of

Commons through Dr. Freind, one of its fellows and member for Launceston. Fielding guessed that a hundred thousand in England lived on drink alone. Six gallons of spirits per head of the population per annum is an estimate for this period against one gallon at present (p. 181).

The years of 1718-19, 1727-29, and 1740-42 were especially marked out by severe attacks of epidemic fever in England, Scotland, and Ireland. Ireland, too, suffered very severely from famine and dysentery in the years 1740-41, and from this time onwards for more than a century the country was never free from the worst forms of starvation fevers.

**Smallpox.**

The great event of the period, however, was smallpox and its abortive treatment. Smallpox has been endemic in England from an early period, but it does not appear to have taken a leading position until the reign of James I. It was then a mild disorder, and was thought to run a particularly favourable course in infants. The mortality from the disease increased greatly after the Restoration, but we have no means of ascertaining whether this was due to an increase in its virulence or to an alteration in the methods of treating it. It is certain, however, that it now began to occur in widely spread epidemics, and that very few escaped its disfiguring effects. The years 1710 and 1719 were especially remarkable for epidemics: 3,138 persons died of this disease in London alone in 1710, and it was equally fatal in other parts of the country; for Hearne, in his diaries, makes several allusions to its devastating effects at Oxford. The epidemic of 1719 was even more destructive, for out of 28,347 deaths in London from all causes, no fewer than 3,229 were due to smallpox. The disease is so unmistakable that it is probable these figures are approximately correct. Such great outbreaks of disease naturally called attention to the subject, and a determined endeavour was made to reduce its fatal effects. Dr. Woodward, Gresham professor of physic, read a communication from Dr. Emanuel Timonius before the Royal Society in 1714. This communication was dated Constantinople, December, 1713, and it gives an account "of the procuring of the smallpox by incision or inoculation, as it has for some time been practised at Constantinople." The interesting nature of the paper led Sir Hans Sloane to make further inquiries into the utility of the practice. The accounts from Smyrna were satisfactory, but it was

not until the spring of 1721 that it began to be practised in a tentative manner by the medical profession in England, though it had already been adopted in New England in consequence of the great epidemic of 1721-2 at Boston. The merit of putting the inoculation for smallpox upon a practical basis rests with

Inoculation.



SIR HANS SLOANE, BY THOMAS MURRAY.

(By permission of the Royal College of Physicians.)

Lady Mary Wortley Montague, whose husband was ambassador to the Porte. She had her son, aged five, inoculated in March, 1717-8. The result was successful, for the child had a mild attack of smallpox. The Princess of Wales, with whom Lady Mary was on terms of intimate friendship, took up the matter. Some preliminary experiments were made first upon three men



and three women, condemned criminals whose capital sentence was remitted on condition that they were inoculated, afterwards upon six charity children of the parish of St. James's, and then upon five more hospital children. The results in each case were



LADY MARY WORTLEY MONTAGUE, BY JONATHAN RICHARDSON.

*(By permission of the Right Hon. the Earl of Wharfedale.)*

so satisfactory that in April, 1722, Sergeant-Surgeon Amyand, acting under the direction of Sir Hans Sloane, inoculated the Princess Amelia, aged eleven, and the Princess Caroline, aged nine, daughters of the Prince of Wales. The successful issue of these cases enabled the operation to be performed without restriction, though the practice did not come into general

use until 1740. It then flourished vigorously for many years, until its performance was rendered a penal offence by the Act of 1840, but vaccination was not rendered compulsory until 1853.

We know but little of the condition of the public services during the wars of Marlborough, for it is not until Sergeant-Surgeon Ranby attended the king to the campaign which ended at Dettingen that we obtain the account of an eye-witness. The condition of the medical officers in the early part of the century was probably not much superior to that which they occupied in John Woodall's time (Vol. IV., p. 630), when, "If the Surgeon's mate cannot trimme men, then by due consequence there is to be a barber to the Ship's Company." The list of instruments necessary for each surgeon's mate shows that he was expected to act as barber, chiropodist, and, as he was to be provided with an "eare-picker," it is probable that he was called upon to perform still more menial services. His pay was good, for the surgeon in the great ships of the first and second rank received £17 10s., and in ships of the fifth rank, generically termed "Lyons' whelpes," £6 a-piece in addition to certain perquisites of office.

The Army  
and Naval  
Medical  
Services.

THE death of the greatest of English classical scholars in the last year of the period covered by this chapter affords an opportunity for a retrospect over the history of classical learning in England. That history has been touched upon at earlier points in this narrative. Before the Renaissance the most notable representatives of classical learning in this country were Bede and Alcuin, John of Salisbury and Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln (Vol. I., pp. 224, 493, 624). Its subsequent history down to the death of Bentley (1742), falls into three periods, the foremost name in the third being that of Bentley himself. In the first, extending from about 1485 to 1570, the names of Linacre and Erasmus, of Ascham and Buchanan, may be here recalled as representing that imitative, elegant and tasteful type of scholarship which is characteristic of the Italian scholars of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. This period has already been briefly reviewed in the pages on the New Learning in a previous volume (III., pp. 112-128).

J. E.  
SANDYS.  
English  
Scholar-  
ship.  
1570-1742.

First  
Period:  
1485-1570.

Second  
Period :  
1570-1700.

The second period, which is the subject of the following retrospect, extends from about the last quarter of the sixteenth century to the end of the seventeenth. In contrast with the first, or *Italian* period, it is mainly marked by a many-sided knowledge of the subject-matter of classical antiquity, by industrious erudition rather than by special attention to the form of the classical languages. Its representatives are, in Germany, Gruter and Spanheim; in Italy, Fabretti; in Holland, Lipsius, Grotius, Gerard John Voss and his three sons, Daniel Heinsius and his son Nicolaus, as well as Salmasius and Grævius; in France, Scaliger, Casaubon, Montfaucon, and many others. The importance of the French representatives leads to this being sometimes distinguished as the *French* period. England was represented in this age by not a few of her own countrymen, and, besides having a point of contact with Salmasius owing to his celebrated controversy with Milton, was connected with some of the most eminent of the above scholars by ties of sympathy and hospitality.<sup>1</sup> More than one country may claim Janus Gruter, who was born at Antwerp, the son of the burgomaster of that city, but owed his first knowledge of Latin to his mother, an accomplished Englishwoman. Having been educated at Norwich Grammar School, he was admitted a member of Gonville and Caius College in 1577. He began his University studies at Cambridge; continued them at the Dutch University of Leyden; and finally lived at Heidelberg from 1592 to 1627, there producing a vast number of editions of classical authors, which are inferior in reputation to the great collection of Greek and Roman inscriptions which he published in 1602-3, with the important aid of Scaliger. Scaliger himself, who, under his father's scholarly training, became distinguished for the vigour of his Latin prose and for his mastery of metre, first made his mark as an able textual critic; by the publication

Visits of  
Gruter,  
1580-1627.

Scaliger,  
1540-1609.

<sup>1</sup> Apart from Gruter, Scaliger, and Casaubon, Gerard John Voss (1577-1649) and his son Isaac visited England in 1607 and 1629 respectively, both of them receiving ecclesiastical preferment in this country, with the distinction of an honorary degree at Oxford; while Spanheim (1629-1710), who passed the last eight or nine years of his long life as the Ambassador of Prussia in London, was in his old age one of Bentley's correspondents and presented him with his portrait, still preserved in the Master's Lodge at Trinity College, Cambridge.

lication of his treatise "De Emendatione Temporum" in 1583, and his "Thesaurus Temporum" in 1606, he attained the further fame of being the creator of the science of chronology and the father of historical criticism. After travelling in Italy with Muretus, he visited Edinburgh, Oxford, and Cambridge in 1566; but it was not until the beginning of the last period of his life, his professorship at Leyden (1593-1609), that he counted Camden among his correspondents.<sup>1</sup> Taste and erudition were happily combined in Scaliger; Casaubon, who, in France, had been second in erudition to Scaliger alone, but had no pretensions to his taste, might well have been summoned to succeed him at Leyden. Instead of this he was invited to England by Archbishop Bancroft, and there passed the last four years of his life (1610-14) as a prebendary of Canterbury in high favour with James I. Thus far he had edited Strabo, Polyænus, Aristotle, Theophrastus, Diogenes Laertius, Suetonius, Athenæus, Persius, and the "Scriptores Historiæ Augustæ." But now "learning ceased to occupy his mind" though "he occasionally thought, with a sigh of regret, of his unfinished Polybius."<sup>2</sup> Most of his time was absorbed in the refutation of Baronius, the result being not exactly a decisive triumph, although he had the advantage in his adversary's "entire want of Greek, and of classical learning of any kind."<sup>3</sup> Four years before arriving in England Casaubon had been in correspondence with Sir Henry Savile, then provost of Eton and warden of Merton; and, in 1613, he was escorted by Savile to Oxford, where he spent many hours among the treasures of the Bodleian; but the characters of these two eminent scholars were too dissimilar to allow of their ever becoming intimate friends. "Casaubon, insignificant in presence, the most humble of men, but intensely real, knowing what he knew with fatal accuracy, and keeping his utterance below his knowledge; Sir Henry, the munificent patron of learning, and devoting his fortune to its promotion, with a fine presence, polished manners, and courtly speech," but "not free from the swagger and braggadocio affected by the courtiers of James and Charles."<sup>4</sup> Savile was probably, in ancient literature, the most learned Englishman of his

and  
Casaubon,  
1559-1614

Savile,  
1549-1622.

<sup>1</sup> Pattison's "Essays," i., pp. 135, 145, 161, 212-5.

<sup>2</sup> Pattison, "Life of Casaubon," p. 321.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 373.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 399.

time. In 1581 he had published a translation of part of Tacitus;<sup>1</sup> his "Commentaries on Roman Warfare" (1598) were the first contribution made by England to the literature of classical antiquities, and both of these works met with recognition abroad; while, in 1612, he had lavished his resources on producing at a press established by himself at Eton, with types and pressmen from Holland, a magnificent edition of Chrysostom. Among those who aided in this work was Andrew Downes (1550-1627), for forty years Professor of Greek at Cambridge, "the ablest Grecian in Christendom, being no native of Greece."<sup>2</sup>

Trans-  
lations.

Among translations from classical authors an important place must be assigned to Sir Thomas North's translation of Amyot's Plutarch (1579), which supplied Shakespeare with materials for his *Julius Caesar*, *Antony and Cleopatra*, and *Coriolanus*. A spirited version of Homer was executed by George Chapman (1557-1634), of Trinity College, Oxford, the friend of Shakespeare and Spenser; while his contemporary, Philemon Holland (1551-1636), Fellow of Trinity, Cambridge, by his renderings of Livy (1600), Pliny (1601), Plutarch's "Moralia," Suetonius, and Ammianus Marcellinus, earned for himself the title of "Translator-General" of his age.

Gataker,  
1574-1654.

The first Latin translation of Aristotle's "Ethics" printed in England was that published at Oxford in 1479; the first English edition of a classical author is Pynson's Terence, 1497; and the first original commentary on any classical work, published in this country, is the learned edition of Marcus Aurelius Antoninus, published in 1652 by Thomas Gataker, of St. John's, Cambridge. His "Adversaria," not published until 1659, include many valuable remarks on points of classical learning, and attest the vast extent of his reading.

Selden,  
1584-1654.

The learned Selden (Vol. IV., p. 136), who was ten years younger than Gataker, but died in the same year, is best known as a jurist; in his "Marmora Arundeliana" (1629) he produced the first edition of the important Greek chronological document called the "Marmor Parium," now at Oxford.

It was a curate to Gataker, Thomas Young, who was private tutor to Milton in his boyhood, and was one of the five authors

<sup>1</sup> The correction, *Intemelio* (for *in templo*) in Tacitus, "Agricola," c. 8, is due to Savile.

<sup>2</sup> "Life of Sir Simonds D'Ewes," i. 139.

Milton.  
1603-1674

of "Smectymnuus." The poet's classical training may be traced in the autobiographical parts of his "Apology," where he describes himself at Cambridge as "not unstudied in those authors which are most commended," and gave "Orators and Historians," "the smooth Elegiac Poets," and the "divine volumes of Plato and Xenophon." In his five years of retirement at Horton we find him enjoying "a complete holiday in turning over Latin and Greek authors"; and, in his tractate "Of Education," his own encyclopædic reading prompts him to suggest that his ideal students should begin with Cebes, Plutarch, and "other Socratic discourses"; "the next step would be to the authors of agriculture, Cato, Varro, and Columella." "The difficulties of grammar being soon overcome, all the historical physiology of Aristotle and Theophrastus are open before them"; "the like access will be to Vitruvius, to Seneca's 'Natural Questions,' to Mela, Celsus, Pliny, or Solinus." "Then also those poets which are now counted most hard will be both facile and pleasant, Orpheus, Hesiod, Theocritus, Aratus, Nicander, Oppian, Dionysius, and in Latin, Lucretius, Manilius, and the rural part of Virgil." Thereupon "their young and pliant affections are led through all the moral works of Plato, Xenophon, Cicero, Plutarch, Laertius, and those Locrian remnants"; "those tragedies also that treat of household matters, as *Trachinæ*, *Alcestis*, and the like"; "those extolled remains of Grecian lawgivers, Lycurgus, Solon, Zaleucus, Charondas, and thence to all the Roman Edicts and Tables with their Justinian." "Then will the choice histories, heroic poems, and Attic tragedies of stateliest and most regal argument, with all the famous political orations, offer themselves"; Logic, also, "so much as is useful," to be followed by "a graceful and ornate Rhetoric taught out of the rule of Plato, Aristotle, Phalereus, Cicero, Hermogenes, Longinus"; and lastly, "the Art of Poetry in Aristotle's Poetics and in Horace."

The list of authors actually used by Milton in instructing his pupils is no less wonderful in its comprehensiveness.<sup>1</sup> Milton's copies of Aratus, Lycophron, Euripides, and Pindar are still in existence, with marginal memoranda evincing his critical skill; and the results of his reading may also be traced in the classical flavour which pervades his poems. Nor can we here

<sup>1</sup> Todd's "Milton," i. 29.

entirely forget the tasteful versification of the Latin Elegiacs of his earlier life, or the tribute paid to his scholarship by his appointment as Latin Secretary to the Commonwealth, from 1649 to 1659.

**Duport.**

During the Civil War James Duport (1606–79), Professor of Greek, quietly went on lecturing on Theophrastus at Cambridge; he also translated the Book of Job, as well as the Books of Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Solomon, into Homeric

verse; and, in 1660, produced his "*Homeri Gnomologia*." In that year, instead of resuming his professorship, he recommended that the chair should be filled by his pupil, Isaac Barrow (1630–77), but his distinguished successor's lectures were scantily attended. "I sit like an Attic owl," he says, "driven out from the society of other birds."<sup>1</sup> In 1663 Thomas Stanley (1625–78), of Pembroke Hall, produced a celebrated edition of *Æschylus*, including many unpublished emendations, borrowed without



BISHOP PEARSON.  
(Clare College, Cambridge.)

acknowledgment from Casaubon, Dorat, and Scaliger. Meric Casaubon (1599–1671), son of the great Casaubon, was educated at Eton and Oxford, and published notes on Persius, Antoninus, and Diogenes Laertius; and Isaac Voss (1618–89), the youngest son of Gerard John Voss, of Leyden, closed his life in England as Canon of Windsor (1673–89), after publishing his *Catullus* in London in 1684. Among our own countrymen one of the finest scholars was John Pearson, Master of Jesus and Trinity, Cambridge, and Bishop of Chester (1673), whose fame rests mainly

**Bishop  
Pearson.**

<sup>1</sup> Barrow's "*Opuscula*," iv. 111.

on his "Exposition of the Creed," but who is also known as an annotator on Diogenes Laertius, and as the author of the "*Vindiciæ Ignatianæ*." Of his unfinished work on the Epistles of Ignatius, Bentley said that "the very dust of his writings is gold."<sup>1</sup> Thomas Gale, Professor of Greek at Cambridge (1666), and afterwards Head-master of St. Paul's (1672) and Dean of York (1697), published a collection of the Greek Mythologists and (among many other works) the first English edition of Iamblichus, "*De Mysteriis*." Meanwhile, at Oxford, John Hudson (1660-1719), Librarian of the Bodleian, prepared editions of Thucydides and Josephus; Thomas Creech (1651-1700) produced an edition of Lucretius (1695), which—owing to the clearness and brevity of the notes, mainly abridged from Lambinus—long remained in popular use; and John Potter (1674-1747), who was educated at the same school as Bentley, brought out his "*Lycophron*" and his "*Antiquities of Greece*" at the early age of twenty-three, and afterwards became Bishop of Oxford (1715) and Archbishop of Canterbury (1737-47).<sup>2</sup> William Baxter (1650-1723), Head-master of Merchant Taylors' School, and editor of Anacreon and Horace, published, under the title of "*De Analogia, seu arte Latinæ Linguae Commentarius*," the first Latin Grammar of a more than elementary type which had appeared in England.<sup>3</sup> Dryden's translation of Virgil, and Evelyn's "*Discourse of Medals Ancient and Modern*," both appeared in 1697. The only other names that we need mention here are those of Joshua Barnes (1654-1712) of Emmanuel, Professor of Greek at Cambridge (1695), editor of Euripides (1694), Anacreon (1705), and Homer (1711), described by Bentley as a man "of singular industry and a most diffuse reading"; and Henry Dodwell (1641-1711), Professor of History at Oxford in 1688, the learned author of the chronological treatise "*De Cyclis Veterum*" (1701) and of the "*Annales Thucydidei et Xenophontei*" (1702). The Professor of Greek at

Thomas  
Gale,  
1655-1702,  
and  
others.

<sup>1</sup> "Dissertation on Phalaris," p. 417, Wagner. Pearson's "*Adversaria Hesychiana*" were edited by Gaisford in 1844. His "*Annales Cyprianici*" appeared in the great edition of Cyprian, published in 1682 by John Fell (1625-86), successively Dean of Christ Church and Chancellor and Bishop of Oxford.

<sup>2</sup> Potter's famous edition of Clement of Alexandria was published in 1715.

<sup>3</sup> 1679. The well-known "*Grammaticæ Latinæ Institutiones*" of Thomas Ruddiman (1674-1757) was first published at Edinburgh in 1725.



Cambridge accepted the "Epistles of Euripides" as genuine; the Professor of History at Oxford, while composing his treatise "De Cyclis Veterum," had taken the "Epistles of Phalaris" as his guide in determining certain points of chronology. The errors of both were, happily, set right by Bentley in the course of the remarkable controversy on the Letters of Phalaris.

Third  
Period :  
Bentley,  
1662-1742.

Richard Bentley was educated at Wakefield, and admitted at St. John's College, Cambridge, at the age of fourteen years and four months. His own college was prevented from electing him to a fellowship, owing to there being no vacancy in the only two fellowships then open to natives of Yorkshire, but it appointed him Head-master of Spalding (1682). In the following year he accepted the invitation of a late Fellow of St. John's, Stillingfleet, Dean of St. Paul's, to be the private tutor of his son; and in the library of Stillingfleet, one of the best private libraries in the world, Bentley laid the foundation of his future fame by the study of Hebrew and the criticism of the New Testament, and, above all, by the widest research in classical literature. In 1689 he went into residence with his pupil at Wadham College, Oxford, and thus gained constant access to the treasures of the Bodleian. He was now meditating nothing short of a complete collection of the fragments of the Greek Poets, as well as an edition of all the Greek lexicographers. What he actually published at this time was his "Letter to Mill" (1691), written as an appendix to Chilmead's edition of the chronicler John Malelas of Antioch, which was being published under the superintendence of Dr. Mill, with prolegomena by Humphrey Hody, the author of a learned work on the Septuagint. Bentley here presented the world of scholars with the firstfruits of his study of the Attic dramatists, while he also gave early proof of his mastery of metrical questions by discovering the continuity of the anapestic system. In the course of ninety-eight pages he corrects or explains more than sixty Greek and Latin writers. It was an achievement which spread his fame beyond the bounds of England; and two of the foremost scholars of the age, Grævius and Spanheim, hailed him as the "new and already bright star" of English letters.<sup>1</sup> In the following year he was appointed to deliver the first course of lectures on the foundation of Robert Boyle; and, in connection with his argument for the

<sup>1</sup> Monk's "Life of Bentley," i. 31, note.

existence of an Intelligent Providence, he gave the first popular exposition of the discoveries of Newton (whose "Principia" had been published only five years previously). In the same year, 1692, Sir William Temple published his "Essay on Ancient and Modern Learning," attacking the opinions of Perrault (1687) and "Phalaris."



RICHARD BENTLEY, BY THOMAS HUDSON.

(Trinity College, Cambridge.)

Fontenelle (1688), who had recently been claiming for the moderns a superiority in point of genius over the foremost writers of antiquity. For our present purpose the following is the most important passage:—

"It may, perhaps, be further affirmed in favour of the Ancients, that the oldest books we have are still in their kind the best. The two most ancient that I know of in prose, among those we call profane authors, are

*Æsop's Fables* and *Phalaris's Epistles*, both living near the same time, which was that of *Cyrus* and *Pythagoras*. As the first has been agreed by all ages since for the greatest master in his kind, and all others of that sort have been but imitators of his original; so I think the *Epistles* of *Phalaris* to have more grace, more spirit, more force of wit and genius, than any others I have ever seen, either ancient or modern. I know that several learned men (or that usually pass for such, under the name of critics) have not esteemed them genuine; and *Politian*, with some others, have attributed them to *Lucian*: but I think he must have little skill in painting that cannot find out this to be an original. Such diversity of passions, upon such variety of actions and passages of life and government; such freedom of thought, such boldness of expression; such bounty to his friends, such scorn to his enemies; such honour of learned men, such esteem of good; such knowledge of life, such contempt of death, with such fierceness of nature and cruelty of revenge, could never be represented but by him that possessed them. And I esteem *Lucian* to have been no more capable of writing than of acting what *Phalaris* did. In all one writ, you find the scholar or the sophist; and in all the other, the tyrant and the commander."<sup>1</sup>

Boyle's  
*Phalaris*.

While Bentley's friend, William Wotton, of St. Catharine's, was engaged in preparing a judicious examination of this essay, published in 1694 under the title of "*Reflections upon Ancient and Modern Learning*," Bentley assured him that the two books which Temple had pronounced the oldest and best in the world were in truth neither old nor good; that the *Æsopian Fables* were not the work of *Æsop*; and that the *Epistles* of *Phalaris* were a forgery of a later age. In the meantime Temple's panegyric had brought the *Epistles* into demand, and had prompted Dr. Aldrich, Dean of Christ Church, to suggest to a youthful member of the House, the Honourable Charles Boyle, nephew of the founder of the Boyle lectures, the preparation of an edition of the *Epistles*. Boyle wrote to his bookseller in London, instructing him to obtain a collation of a manuscript of "*Phalaris*" in the library of St. James's. Bentley, on hearing of the proposed edition, informed the bookseller that "the book was a spurious piece, and deserved not to be spread in the world by another impression";<sup>2</sup> but, on becoming Librarian, he gave the bookseller every reasonable facility for obtaining the collation desired. The collation was not actually completed, and the bookseller, who had himself been remiss in the matter, unfairly laid the blame on Bentley. Boyle's edition appeared early in

<sup>1</sup> Temple's Works, i. 166, ed. 1750.

<sup>2</sup> Bentley, "*Phalaris*," p. xxxvi., ed. 1699.

1695, with a statement in the preface that only forty of the Epistles had been collated with the one hundred and twenty-seven included in the manuscript in the Royal Library, *cujus mihi copiam ulteriorem Bibliothecarius pro singulari sua humanitate negavit*.<sup>1</sup> In connection with the controversy which was now imminent, it must be clearly understood that Boyle never maintained the genuineness of the Letters. His preface states several strong reasons to the contrary, but he is content to leave it an open question. It was Sir William Temple, not Boyle, who was committed to the opinion that the author was Phalaris. A second edition of Wotton's "Reflections" was now called for, and the author exacted the performance of Bentley's promise to write an Appendix on Æsop and Phalaris. This promise was fulfilled in 1697.

Bentley's  
Phalaris.

Bentley begins by arguing against the *chronology* of the Letters, and by exposing several flagrant anachronisms. Placing the age of Phalaris at the latest possible date of 550 B.C., he shows that one Sicilian city, Phintia, mentioned in the Letters, was not built until nearly three centuries after; that another, Alsæa, was founded more than 140 years later; that the "Thericlean cups," presented by Phalaris to his physician, owed their name to a potter of Corinth, who was a contemporary of Aristophanes, more than 120 years later. Again, the Letters speak now of "Zancle," and now of "Messana"; whereas Zancle and Messana were one and the same city, and Zancle did not receive the name of Messana until more than sixty years after the death of the tyrant of Agrigentum; similarly, they speak of "Tauromenium," although that name was given to the Sicilian city of Naxos many generations after his time. Moreover, the author uses the quaint phrase, "to extirpate like a pine tree," which originated with Cræsus, who began to reign in Lydia some years after Phalaris had been slain in Sicily; another of his phrases, "words are the shadow of deeds," really belongs to Democritus, more than a century later. The author also betrays on acquaintance with verses of Pindar and Callimachus, poets of later ages; and not only quotes a passage found in



CHARLES BOYLE, EARL OF ORRERY.

(E. Budge, "Memoirs of the Late Earl of Orrery.")

<sup>1</sup> "The further use of which the librarian, with his own peculiar politeness, refused to me."

Euripides, but actually mentions "tragedies," although Greek tragedy arose some years later than the tyrant's death.

Bentley next attacks the *language*, which is Attic, instead of Doric, as might have been expected of the King of the Dorian colony of Agrigentum. Even the sums of money mentioned are of the Athenian standard, whereas the Sicilian talent was only a two-thousandth part of the Attic. He sums up the examination of their subject-matter thus:—

"Take them in the whole bulk . . . I should say they are a fardle of common-places, without life or spirit from action and circumstance . . . . You feel, by the emptiness and deadness of them, that you converse with some dreaming pedant with his elbow on his desk; not with an active, ambitious tyrant, with his hand on his sword, commanding a million of subjects."<sup>1</sup>

Bentley next examines the Letters of Themistocles, of Socrates, and of Euripides, proving them to have been forged many centuries after the age of the persons whose names they bear. His arguments, as before, turn on points of history and chronology, and on the extravagant matter and tasteless language of these productions.

With regard to the Letters of Euripides, Joshua Barnes, in his edition of 1694, had, in spite of a private letter from Bentley, declared that to doubt their being the genuine work of Euripides was a proof of either "effrontery or incapacity." Bentley quietly and dispassionately repeats the arguments of his letter, reinforcing them with several others.

As to the *Æsopian Fables*, Bentley holds that they are a version by a Byzantine writer of the fourteenth century, Maximus Planudes, who paraphrased in prose a collection of fables written in choliambic verse by Babrius, whom Bentley regards as "one of the latest age of good writers."

#### The Reply.

Bentley's attack on Phalaris produced a great sensation. Some of the ablest members of Christ Church, Francis Atterbury, afterwards Bishop of Rochester, and George Smalridge, with Robert Freind and his brother John, formed a confederacy for aiding Boyle to meet the onslaught. Their united learning was not equal to that of Bentley; even in humour and sarcasm they were no match for their opponent. But their literary skill and their powerful connections were sufficient to ensure a wide popularity for their work. No less than three editions of their reply appeared in two years, and, at first, the popular opinion was entirely in favour of Boyle. Pepys, writing at an early stage in the controversy, says:—"I suspect Mr. Boyle is in the right; for our friend's learning (which I have a great value for) wants a little filing; and I doubt not but a few such strokes as this will do it and him good."<sup>2</sup> Swift, who

<sup>1</sup> Page 437 ed. 1699; p. 465, Wagner.

<sup>2</sup> January, 1695 (Monk's "Life of Bentley," i. 71).

was living at Moor Park under the patronage of Sir William Temple, joined in the fray by attacking Bentley in the course of his "Tale of a Tub,"<sup>1</sup> most of which was composed in 1696, and also in his "Battle of the Books,"<sup>2</sup> with its "Episode of Bentley and Wotton," written in the following year. Temple himself, who died early in 1698, lived long enough to praise the "pleasant turns of wit," and the "easiness of style," which marked Boyle's reply to what he had the assurance to describe as such "foul-mouthed raillery." Garth, one of Bentley's contemporaries at Cambridge and a relation of the Boyles, pronounced his opinion on the merits of the combatants in the couplet—

"So diamonds take a lustre  
from their foil,  
And to a Bentley 'tis we  
owe a Boyle."<sup>3</sup>

Evelyn alone "stood up for" his friend, waiting till he had heard both sides.<sup>4</sup>

Bentley replied by publishing, early in 1699, an enlarged Dissertation,

which had justly been regarded as marking an epoch not only in the life of the author but also in the history of literature. His victory was really complete, but its effect was not immediately felt in all its fulness. Not one, however, of the Boylean confederacy ever again appeared before the world as a critic,<sup>5</sup> though many years had to elapse before Tyrwhitt could



FRONTISPIECE TO SWIFT'S "BATTLE OF THE BOOKS."

Bentley's  
Rejoinder.

<sup>1</sup> Pages 51, 63, 67, ed. 1869. <sup>2</sup> Pages 101, 103, 105-9. <sup>3</sup> Garth's "Dispensary" (1699). <sup>4</sup> April 21, 1698; Bentley's "Correspondence," p. 167, ed. 1842.


<sup>5</sup> Monk's "Life," i. 136.

Critical  
Scholar-  
ship.

describe the opponents of Bentley as "laid low by the thunder-bolt,"<sup>1</sup> or Porson pronounce it an "immortal dissertation."<sup>2</sup> Even apart from the merits of the purely controversial portions, it has a permanent value owing to the vast amount of interesting and accurate information which it embodies on points of history and chronology, antiquities, philology, and criticism—such as the age of Pythagoras, the origins of Greek tragedy, the anapæstic metre, and the coinage of Sicily. It is not solely "a masterpiece of controversy" and a "storehouse of erudition." It is also an example of critical method, marking the beginning of the *critical* school of classical scholarship, which henceforth prevailed among the leading representatives of learning in England and Holland, until it was succeeded by the *systematic* or *encyclopaedic* school of scholarship, which begins in Germany about 1783 with the great name of Friedrich Augustus Wolf.

Bentley  
Master of  
Trinity.

In 1700 Bentley was appointed Master of Trinity. As Master, he encouraged the study of astronomy, chemistry, and Hebrew, and some of his reforms—such as the introduction of written examinations for fellowships and annual elections to scholarships—were inspired by a genuine desire for the welfare of the College; but in many of his disciplinary measures he



"HORACE AT CAMBRIDGE."

(W. King, "Useful Miscellanies," 1712.)

acted on his own authority without consulting his statutable counsellors, and his rule was arrogant, arbitrary, and autocratic. Serious feuds accordingly arose, which came to a head in 1710, when the complaints of the Fellows led to the question being

long debated before the courts of law, as to whether the Crown or the Bishop of Ely was the general visitor of the College according to the Statutes. At last, in 1714, Moore, Bishop of Ely, after a trial extending over six weeks, ordered a sentence of deprivation to be prepared, but, before he could pronounce judgment, he died on July 31st. Queen Anne

<sup>1</sup> "De Babrio" (1776), quoted in Maehly's "Bentley," p. 117, n. 44.

<sup>2</sup> Watson's "Life of Porson," p. 28. The tardy recognition of Bentley's victory was first pointed out in Professor Jebb's "Bentley" (1882), pp. 81-83.

died on the day following. The next Bishop of Ely, Fleetwood, declined to interfere; but under his successor, Greene, a fresh attempt was made in 1728 to obtain a visitation of the College; in 1734 Bentley was sentenced to be deprived of his mastership, but this could only be effected by the vice-master, who preferred to resign and was succeeded by Bentley's devoted adherent, Walker. Further litigation ensued, which was terminated by the death of Bishop Greene in 1738.

To return to Bentley's literary labours. In 1700 he contributed an important appendix to the edition of Cicero's Tusculan Disputations by John Davies, Fellow of Queens', and thereby proved himself the first among the moderns to understand the metrical laws followed by the dramatists of Rome. This appendix was coldly received in Holland by Le Clerc, and Bentley retaliated in 1710 by sending to Le Clerc's enemy, Peter Burman, under the assumed name of *Phileleutherus Lipsiensis*, a series of emendations of 323 fragments of Philemon and Menander, exposing with the keenest irony the ignorance of their recent editor, Le Clerc. The same year saw the appearance of an edition of Homer by Joshua Barnes, a work published at the expense of Mrs. Barnes, who had been prompted to this work of generosity by her husband's representation that the Homeric poems were written by King Solomon. The work was published in a fit of resentment against Bentley, who had a just contempt for the editor's want of judgment and critical accuracy. In 1711 Bentley's Horace was given to the world, with more than 700 alterations in the text, mainly due to the editor's own conjectures. In this work the editor puts too strict a limit to the author's poetic fancy, and thus too often reduces the poetry of Horace to the level of precise and logical prose. But even the very errors of so great a critic are often instructive, and the commentary abounds in unquestionably valuable hints on grammar and metre, while in the preface we have a serious attempt to deal with the chronology of the poet's works. In 1721 Bentley successfully restored the ancient inscription on the pedestal of the statue of Apollo at Delos;<sup>1</sup> he was still more strikingly successful, in 1729, in restoring the text of the eight elegiac lines found on the site of Chalcedon on the Bosphorus, and inaccurately copied by Wheeler and Spon, and

Bentley's  
Further  
Work.

Horace.

Greek Epi-  
graphy.

<sup>1</sup> Letter to Dr. Mead, p. 589 of "Correspondence," ed. 1842.



- Chishull.<sup>1</sup> Two years afterwards, the marble itself was brought to England, and Bentley's restoration was confirmed in every point. To 1722 belongs his revision of Nicander. Early in 1726
- Terence.** he produced his edition of Terence, with a preliminary dissertation on the metres, a work executed with remarkable rapidity, in which the editor's genius, acumen, and nice appreciation of rhythm enabled him to restore the text in a vast number of passages. His emendations of Plautus are no less remarkable.<sup>2</sup> An edition of Lucan was also projected, but Bentley's notes were not published until eighteen years after his death. His criticisms on Lucretius, which were first printed in full in 1813, led Munro to remark that had Bentley had the use of the MSS. of Voss, which were taken back to Holland in 1690, he "might have anticipated what Lachmann did by a century and a half."<sup>3</sup>
- Milton Emended.** In 1732 he published his extraordinary revision of the text of Milton's "Paradise Lost," altering "darkness visible" into "a transpicuous gloom," and in many other passages revealing a singular absence of poetic taste. In the same year, and again in 1734, he was at work on a long-meditated edition of Homer, his main object being to restore the versification of the poet, the rhythm of whose lines was often marred by what appeared to be open vowels and other metrical defects. The restoration was to be effected by the aid of MSS., quotations and scholiasts, but, above all, by the introduction of the lost letter, the ancient *digamma*. Its introduction accounts for many of the metrical peculiarities of the Homeric poems; and the discovery of this important fact was made by Bentley as early as 1713.<sup>4</sup> His latest classical work was his publication, in 1739, of the astronomical poet, Manilius, which had been reported as ready for the press forty years before.
- Homer and the Digamma.**
- A Greek Testament.** Meanwhile, in the department of sacred criticism, Bentley had announced to the Archbishop of Canterbury, in 1716, a project for publishing a critical edition of the New Testament. In 1720 he issued his proposals to the public. His aim was to restore the text "as it was in the best exemplars at the time of the Council of Nice (325). The proposals became the subject

<sup>1</sup> Letter to Dr. Mead, pp. 698-703: cf. Jebb's "Bentley," p. 137.

<sup>2</sup> Published by Prof. Sonnenschein in his "Captivi" (1880) and in "Anecdota Oxoniensia" (1883).

<sup>3</sup> Munro's "Lucretius," i. p. 17, ed. 1873

<sup>4</sup> "Monk's "Life," i. 363; and Jebb's "Bentley," p. 150.

of a miserable controversy, raised by Conyers Middleton. Had they been carried out, they might have anticipated in a large measure the results which were attained in the nineteenth century.

Bentley was the honoured correspondent of many scholars at home and abroad. Among the earliest of these is the aged Grævius, who was one of the first to prognosticate his eminence, and who published in 1697 Bentley's edition of more than 400 fragments of Callimachus. Among the rest is the youthful Hemsterhuys, in whose juvenile edition of Pollux Bentley not only recognised learning and acumen, but also detected a lack of metrical knowledge, a revelation which nearly prompted the young editor to abandon the study of Greek altogether.<sup>1</sup> Bentley promoted the publication of Küster's Suidas at the University Press, which was indebted to Bentley's taste and enterprise for the new types which he ordered from Holland in 1696;<sup>2</sup> he also aided the same scholar in 1708 by his critical epistles on Aristophanes, which have repeatedly suggested the regret that an edition of that poet was not produced by Bentley himself. Another of his Dutch correspondents was Burman,<sup>3</sup> who shared his interest in the textual criticism of Lucan and other Latin poets. The intimate relations between the foremost English and Dutch scholars during the greater part of the eighteenth century fully justify the designation of the period of scholarship ushered in by Bentley as the *English and Dutch* period. It was in Holland that his greatness received the most ungrudging recognition, from Grævius and Hemsterhuys during his life, and from Valckenaer<sup>4</sup> and Ruhnken<sup>5</sup> after his death.

Correspondence  
with  
Dutch  
Scholars.

It was not until Bentley was too old to be a formidable adversary that he was at all seriously attacked by Pope, who had apparently been nettled by Bentley's "talking against his Homer."<sup>6</sup> Pope, not unnaturally, took the same side as Atterbury and Swift, and Warburton and Arbuthnot. In the "Imitation

Bentley  
and Pope.

<sup>1</sup> "Bentleii et Doctorum Virorum Epistolæ," pp. 250-289, ed. 1825.

<sup>2</sup> Evelyn's "Letter," 17 August 1696; "that noble presse which my worthy and most learned friend . . . is, with greate charge and industrie, erecting now at Cambridge"; Monk's "Life," i. 73, 153; Wordsworth, "Scholæ Academicæ," pp. 383, 384, 387.

<sup>3</sup> "Bentley's Correspondence," ed. 1842; also Appendix to "Bentleii Critica Sacra," pp. 163-180.

<sup>4</sup> Maehly's "Bentley," pp. 113-4.

<sup>5</sup> "Opusc.," p. 192.

<sup>6</sup> Monk's "Life," ii. 372; Jebb's "Bentley," p. 202.

of Horace's Epistle to Augustus" (1737), after criticising Milton, the poet adds:

"Not that I'd lop the beauties from his book.  
Like slashing Bentley with his desprate hook."

A more elaborate attack on the "awful Aristarch" is to be found in the fourth book of the "Dunciad" (March, 1742), where the goddess of Dulness is addressed as follows:—


"Mistress! dismiss that rabble from your throne:  
Avaunt—Is Aristarchus yet unknown?  
Thy mighty scholiast, whose unwearied pains  
Made Horace dull and humbled Milton's strains.  
Turn what they will to verse, their toil is vain:  
Critics like me shall make it prose again.  
Roman and Greek grammarians! Know you better,  
Author of something yet more great than letter;  
While tow'ring o'er your alphabet, like Saul,  
Stands our digamma, and o'ertops them all."

Bentley's  
Friends  
and  
Influence.

Of Bentley's friends it will suffice to say that, in 1697, the club that used to meet in the librarian's apartments at St. James's consisted at its foundation of Evelyn and Wren, Newton and Locke; and that he was familiar with William Wotton and Dr. Richard Mead. Ten years before his death he lost his friend John Davies, of Queens' (1679–1732); and, four years before it, Joseph Wasse, of the same college (1672–1738), the editor of Sallust and Thucydides, of whom he had remarked: "When I am dead, Wasse will be the most learned man in England."<sup>1</sup> In his old age his intimate friends were John Taylor, of St. John's (1703–66), editor of Lysias, and Jeremiah Markland, of Peterhouse (1693–1776), the editor of Statius and of several plays of Euripides, who was among the first to dispute the genuineness of the correspondence between Cicero and Brutus, and of the four speeches *post Reditum*. Among other scholars in the same century, who came directly or indirectly under Bentley's influence, may be mentioned Peter Needham, of St. John's, editor of Hierocles (1709); Samuel Clarke, of Gonville and Caius College (1675–1729), who pays Bentley more than one magnificent compliment in his edition of Cæsar (1712), and, in one of the last notes which he wrote on the "Iliad," draws attention to Bentley's discovery of the digamma; Richard Dawes, of

<sup>1</sup> Nichols, "Literary Anecdotes," i. 263.

Emmanuel (1708-66), the careful student of Attic syntax, who was overshadowed by Bentley and was jealous of his fame; Jonathan Toup, of Exeter College (1713-85), who edited Longinus, and, like Bentley, did much towards the criticism of the Greek lexicographers: Thomas Tyrwhitt, of Queen's (1730-86), Fellow of Merton, and Clerk to the House of Commons, who,



THOMAS TYRWHITT.

(After the picture by Benjamin Wilson.)

besides editing Chaucer and criticising Shakespeare and taking a prominent part in the controversy on the Rowley MSS., elucidated the "Poetics" of Aristotle, discovered a lost speech of Isæus, and, following in the track of Bentley, detected further traces of Babrius in the "Fables of Æsop"<sup>1</sup>; Samuel Musgrave (1739-80), and Benjamin Heath (died in 1766), both of Exeter, and both of them able critics of the Greek Tragic poets; and,

<sup>1</sup> Nichols, "Literary Anecdotes," iii. 147-151.

last but not least, Richard Porson (1759-1808), who was first drawn towards critical research by reading Toup's "Longinus," and was afterwards led by the "Miscellanea Critica" and the

Dissertation on Phalaris" to regard Dawes and Bentley as his great masters in the art of criticism.<sup>1</sup> Bentley, Taylor, and Markland, with Dawes, Toup, Tyrwhitt, and Porson, have been happily described by a friend of the last-mentioned critic as forming the constellation of the "Pleiades" among the English scholars of the eighteenth century.<sup>2</sup> The light of one or two of these seven stars has already grown dim; but the star of Bentley is still shining as the brightest of them all.

Hebrew  
and Ori-  
ental Lan-  
guages.

Hebrew was early studied in England (Vol. I., p. 487), but it is difficult to determine the exact extent of the knowledge possessed by the first translators of the Bible into English. A few Hebrew characters, cut in wood, were used in Robert Wakefield's "Oration" (1524), and the first Hebrew types appear in 1592. At Cambridge we find Chevalier lecturing on Hebrew shortly after the accession of Elizabeth, and his pupil Drusius at Oxford from 1572 to 1576.<sup>3</sup> The history of Hebrew scholarship in England has no event more memorable than the publication of the Old Testament in the Authorised Version of 1611 (Vol. IV., p. 130). Among the twenty-five scholars associated in this work, we find two of great general reputation, Lancelot Andrewes and John Overall; among the rest, Lively, Spalding, King, and Byng were successively Professors of Hebrew at Cambridge, and Harding and Kilbye at Oxford. Bedwell was the most distinguished Arabic scholar of his time, while Thompson of Clare, Chaderton of Emmanuel, and Miles Smith of Brasenose were celebrated for their knowledge of ancient languages.<sup>4</sup> An important impulse was given to the study of Oriental languages by Archbishop Laud, on his appointment as Chancellor of Oxford. In 1630 he founded a lectureship in Arabic; the lecturer was specially directed to treat Arabic in its relation with Hebrew and Syriac; and Edward Pocock (1604-91), the first holder of the office, was sent to the East to perfect himself in the language and to collect Oriental MSS. Persian, Turkish, and Arabic MSS. were among the many presented to the Bodleian by Laud, and in 1631 the

<sup>1</sup> Watson's "Life of Porson." pp. 26-7.    <sup>2</sup> Preface to Burney's "Tentamen."

<sup>3</sup> Hallam, ii. 248.    <sup>4</sup> Westcott, "History of the English Bible," p. 149.



TITLE-PAGE OF WALTON'S POLYGLOT BIBLE, BY W. HOLLAR.

University obtained Oriental as well as Greek type, and competent pressmen, from Holland.<sup>1</sup> Hebrew was included in the comprehensive learning of Selden (1584–1684), who published in 1640 his work, “*De Jure Naturali et Gentium juxta Disciplinam Hebræorum*”; and, when present as a Member of Parliament at the assembly of Divines in 1643, “spake admirably and confuted divers of them in their own learning.”<sup>2</sup> Henry Ainsworth, who died at Amsterdam in 1662, proved his eminence as a Biblical commentator by his “*Annotations on the Psalms and Pentateuch*.” John Lightfoot, Master of St. Catharine’s (1602–75), produced his “*Christian and Judaical Miscellanies*” in 1629. The edition of his works in two folio volumes (published in English in 1684 and in Latin in 1686) includes the “*Horæ Hebraicæ*,” which is of permanent value. He was a zealous promoter of the Polyglot Bible associated with the name of Brian Walton (1600–61), who was educated at Cambridge, and, on the breaking out of the Civil War, fled to Oxford, where he formed the plan of the great Polyglot. This was published in six folio volumes, in 1657, with the assistance (among others) of Thomas Hyde, of King’s College, Cambridge (1636–1703), who was successively Keeper of the Bodleian and Professor of Arabic and Hebrew at Oxford. Hyde’s most important work is his “*Veterum Persarum et Magorum Religionis Historia*” (1700). Walton was also assisted by Pocock, whose works include a “*Commentary on the Minor Prophets*,” and “*Specimina Historiæ Arabum*,” as well as an Arabic translation of Grotius “*De Veritate Religionis Christianæ*.” The professorship of Arabic at Cambridge was founded in 1632 by Thomas (afterwards Sir Thomas) Adams, Lord Mayor of London in 1645. The second holder of the professorship, Edmund Castell, of Emmanuel and St. John’s (1606–85), devoted the labour of seventeen years to the preparation, and lavished a handsome fortune on the publication, in 1669, of his “*Lexicon Heptaglotton*,” a dictionary of the Hebrew, Chaldee, Syriac, Samaritan, Æthiopic, Arabic and Persian languages. Another eminent Orientalist, Richard Kinder of Emmanuel (1633–1703), Bishop of Bath and Wells, published a commentary on the five Books of Moses in 1694, and completed his “*Demonstration of the Messiah*” in 1700.

<sup>1</sup> C. H. Simpkinston, “*Life of Laud*,” pp. 164–6.

<sup>2</sup> Whitelocke’s “*Memoirs*,” p. 71, ed. 1732.

Benjamin Kennicott of Wadham spent ten years in the collation of MSS. for his edition of the Hebrew Bible, published in two folio volumes in 1776. Lastly, Robert Lowth of New College (1710-87), successively Bishop of St. David's, Oxford, and London, was elected Professor of Poetry in 1741, and published his "Academic Prelections, 'De Sacra Poesi Hebræorum,'" in 1753, and his "Translation of Isaiah" in 1778.

At the close of the seventeenth century the study of Anglo-Saxon received a fresh impulse, the leader of the movement being Dr. George Hickes (1642-1715; IV., p. 733), Fellow of Lincoln, the author of the first Anglo-Saxon Grammar, and compiler of a once famous work entitled "Thesaurus Linguarum Septentrionalium" (including a very useful catalogue of Anglo-

Anglo-Saxon.



AN EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY VIEW OF OLD ENGLAND.

(Elizabeth Elstob, *Translation of Ælfrie's Homily*, 1700.)

Saxon MSS. prepared by Humphrey Wanley, 1705). Hickes was assisted by his nephew William Elstob and his niece Elizabeth (p. 203). About this time a series of Anglo-Saxon works was printed by the Oxford Press. In 1690 Elstob printed a specimen sheet of King Alfred's translation of Orosius; in 1692 Gibson (1669-1748), the editor of Camden's "Britannia" and afterwards Bishop of Lincoln, published the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle; and the year 1698 saw the appearance of Thwaite's Heptateuch (or the Anglo-Saxon version of the Pentateuch, with Joshua and Judges), and Christopher Rawlinson's edition of King Alfred's Boethius.<sup>1</sup> Richard Rawlinson (IV., p. 735), who died in 1755 and was a relative of Christopher, did further service by the foundation of the Anglo-Saxon Chair at Oxford.

<sup>1</sup> Kemble, in Michel's "Bibliothèque Anglo-Saxonne," 1837, p. 19.



GEORGE  
SAINTS-  
BURY.  
Litera-  
ture.

THE interest of this section, which includes the whole of the reign of George the First and the first half of that of his son, is itself divided, though not in a manner corresponding with the division of the reigns. During the whole of the time Pope's star is in the ascendant—during almost the whole so decidedly in the ascendant, as far as popularity and influence went, that in these respects no one could vie with him. But during the first half of it the older men—the Queen Anne-ites proper—are dying out, and during the second certain appearances of newer schools begin.

Addison  
and his  
School.

The disappearance of the Addison group was, as has been noted, rather curiously rapid. Tickell, indeed, lived nearly as long as Pope himself, who never forgave him the real or presumed intention of competing in that translation of Homer, for which, it may be observed, he was in some respects much more competently equipped. Tickell was what the French call a "moon" of Addison; yet, poetically speaking, he shone more brightly than his sun, and he had a singular gift at the funeral elegy, those on Addison himself and on Cadogan being of remarkable excellence in their kind. But Prior, as has been said, died in 1721, and Parnell (a poet of small productiveness but considerable accomplishment both in the universally known "Hermit," and in some better though less popular things, such as "A Night Piece") in 1718. Congreve and Steele lasted till 1729; but Congreve had been silent, except in trifles, for some thirty years, and Steele produced nothing of moment in his last decade of ill-health, broken fortunes, and seclusion. Of Gay and Young we shall speak presently. But Addison—"Atticus" (it is uncertain whether he ever knew of that tremendous castigation, for it was not even surreptitiously published till after his death)—ended his short and wonderfully successful life in 1719. Of his essays enough has been said; his poems, which made his fortune (especially the famous "Campaign" on the victory of Blenheim), few now read and few need read. Save for that lucky inspiration of the essay which he caught from Steele and utilised, it would be very difficult to call Addison positively great. He was, however, one of the most accomplished men of letters of his time. He had its fullest education, academic and peregrinatory. He had early received magnificent compliments

from Dryden. He became a Privy Councillor and a Secretary of State; he married a countess, and was something of a literary



*Photo: Walter & Cochrane.*

ALEXANDER POPE WITH MARTHA BLOUNT, BY CHARLES JERVAS.  
(National Portrait Gallery.)

monarch in fact as well as in satire. But "Mr. Spectator" made his fame, and, as has been said, Mr. Spectator was something of an adopted son.

Pope's  
Homer.

Although Addison's unkindliness of temper in general, and in particular his jealousy of Pope, may have been exaggerated, and although the general idea of him may be chiefly due to the venomous resentment of the younger man, yet it can hardly be doubted that if Addison had lived he would have been not a little chagrined by Pope's progress. There is no dispute that this Alexander made his great conquest of fame by the translation of Homer, which took him nearly ten years, which he began under the instigation and, so to say, patronage, rather of Swift (at the time a very powerful person) than of Addison, which brought him in between eight and ten thousand pounds, and which left him generally acknowledged as a "greatest living poet." Even greater rewards have sometimes been bestowed for far worse work; yet it is impossible not to feel astonishment at the particular circumstances and conditions of the success. Pope avowedly knew very little Greek, and it may be questioned without much want of charity or indulgence in rashness, whether he knew any. The heroic couplet is probably, of all conceivable measures, the very worst for producing anything even remotely resembling the effect of the Greek hexameter. The age was not in the least in sympathy with the romantic or any period of Greek literature, except the merely rhetorical. And, lastly, now that we have measurably raised the standard of translation, it seems incredible that anything but a decent success of literary esteem, and a fair profit from those who use his work as a "crib," should be the reward of a translator.

But everything was in Pope's favour. In the first place, the "Ancient and Modern" quarrel (p. 81), the disuse of Italian and Spanish, and other things, had created a sort of factitious authority for the classics. In the second, it was the age of literary dictation, and both parties—the Whigs before he quarrelled with them, and even afterwards, the Tories partly out of partisanship and partly through personal friendship—took it from their oracles that Pope was the "best poet living." In the third, he gave them what, if it certainly was not Homer, and was even rather fitfully and doubtfully poetry, -was a great deal of excellent good reading in the fashionable poetical measure of the day, executed in the strict "classical" and "correct" sense with incomparable skill. Just as now thousands of people who have very little real love for music will go to hear a famous

pianist, so then thousands who cared very little for poetry, read this famous, this fashionable, this wonderfully clever performer on the couplet. And when he had finished the performance, he stood alone. Some who might have been his rivals were dead ; others were his friends and almost pupils ; others were hampered by the hardships which came upon men of letters after their brief and brilliant sojourn in the sun of State patronage. Even the innovators were genuinely impressed by his magnificent skill and his towering fame. He maintained that fame during the last fifteen or twenty years of his life by a series of brilliant work of kinds sufficiently different in appearance, though in reality all instances of execution, not of conception or feeling.

His most thoroughgoing admirers would no doubt demur to this, especially in regard to two poems which he wrote, or at any rate published (before the Homer had been very long on the stocks), in 1717. These are the somewhat famous "Elegy on an Unfortunate Lady" and "Eloisa to Abelard." On the other hand, some of those who, admitting Pope's immense literary talent, deny him strictly poetical genius, would perhaps be most ready to join the battle on this very ground. Nowhere has Pope given a fairer ; for he has endeavoured to present in one the mortal agony of a hopeless love, and in the other the mixed delight and remorse and regret of a love which "has been blest," which laments "desiring what is mingled with past years" (how pale the very phrases thus quoted make Pope look in comparison!), and which yet knows or thinks the delight and the desire to be alike vain and sinful. Here, if he is a great general, he must make us come down ; for it is admitted that in no poem—not in the "Messiah" earlier, not in the "Atticus" of about the same date, not in the brilliant insolence of the Dunciad satire and the gloomy splendour of the Dunciad peroration, has he lavished the resources of his art more freely and more judiciously. Yet one of his stoutest defenders in the present generation, calling these poems "melodious and fervid," admits that they "leave us a little cold." A fervour that leaves us cold must surely itself be somewhat akin to frigidity.

The essential quality, indeed, here is the same as almost everywhere, not merely in Pope, but throughout the prose and verse of the period. We never, so to speak, get a feeling, an impression, an image, a thought *direct*. The writer in general,

Pope  
and his  
Medium.

and the poet more particularly, does not see, feel, hear, think, and then give us, according to the laws of art, the expression of seeing, feeling, hearing, thinking. He sits in his library and says to himself, "How can a person of correct taste best present the act of seeing, hearing, feeling, thinking on the part of somebody else who sees, hears, feels, thinks?" Instead of being at one remove only (if even at that, for the greatest literary art simply absorbs the reader in the artist), we are at two or three. We have not even Mr. Pope's idea of an Unfortunate Lady or an Eloisa; we have but Mr. Pope's idea of what "knowing Walsh and Granville the polite" would think it desirable that Mr. Pope should give, if it occurred to him to write about either heroine. That Pope and Pope's contemporaries were not the first to adopt this disastrous prolongation of the circuit, this thrusting apart of the impression and the recipient, is perfectly true; but it is equally untrue that Dryden began it. It is to be seen, before Dryden, in Waller, Cowley, and others; and it is not to be seen either constantly or eminently in Dryden himself. It was Pope who, in regard not merely to descriptions of nature but to the thoughts and feelings of man, made it his universal method—a method which imposed itself even on writers so essentially different from himself as Thomson—and it was Pope whose dazzling performance and all-pervading reputation consecrated this method for more than three-quarters of a century, till Cowper and Crabbe, half unconsciously, Blake in complete unconsciousness, and Wordsworth and Coleridge, as a matter of deliberate crusade, broke the yoke off the nation's neck.

Pope's  
Philo-  
sophy.

By as much, however, as this process of referring everything to a sort of half literary, half social censorship of correctness disabled the practitioners for the highest poetry, by so much did it fit them for the execution of certain kinds where conventional concentration is a positive advantage. Except the *Homer* and the two poems mentioned, the whole production of Pope's last thirty years is more or less satirical—his disastrous excursions into a philosophy which he did not understand being closely connected with satire, but extending themselves not merely to the follies of particulars, but to the limitations of the knowledge, power, and virtue of mankind generally. With respect to this last division, almost everybody now admits that Pope's philosophy is for the most part brilliantly phrased and

versified nonsense. His two most intimate and most remarkable friends were, the one a pessimist of appalling completeness in range and depth, the other an optimist of the most confident shallowness. Pope took Swift's pessimism and Bolingbroke's optimism without in the least comprehending either, and made a muddle of them; and this muddle Warburton set to work to justify and clarify in notes with a skill in commentatorial prestidigitation which, if Naples had been wise, would have established him there as perpetual guardian of the blood of St. Januarius. In another great division of this part of his work—the "Dunciad"—it is admitted that he degraded the idea of a general satire on Dulness, which Swift gave him, into an infinitely little, if also infinitely clever, attack on his private foes—an attack vitiated not only by the constant spite and motive, but by the double mistake of taking for hero, first, a very painstaking and, in his own way, very ingenious hack like Theobald, and then an extremely clever person like Cibber. But some amends, it must be confessed, is made in the splendid finale so often mentioned, and everybody has laughed over details through-

The "Dunciad."



FRONTISPIECE TO POPE'S  
"DUNCIAD," 1728.

out. Between these the main body of Pope's social and personal satires—by whatever name, "Imitations of Horace," Epistles to this person and that, they are called—supplies his finest, most characteristic, and most perfect work. Even here, indeed, we cannot use the word perfect by itself. The large satiric air of Dryden, in which a couplet or even a line sweeps the victim away for ever, to an abyss of contemptuous immortality, is nowhere present. Instead of it, we have the stiletto stroke of a bravo who darts from an ambush, and strikes, and runs away, having missed, or only wounded, as often as he hits. It is a very curious thing that no one ever thinks the worse of

Pope's victims. In spite of knowledge and justice, it is the very hardest thing to persuade oneself that Shadwell was not an utter fool, that there was nearly as much to be said for Shaftesbury as for, let us say, Danby. "The Master has said it," and we feel that the evidence to the contrary may go hang. But who thinks badly of Sporus, or Lady Mary? who thinks worse of Atossa, or even Chartres, because Pope has stigmatised them? No one. We know that Mr. Pope did not at the moment like them; we have a shrewd suspicion, and sometimes more, that Mr. Pope had given them cause not to like him; and we applaud his hits merely as the hits of a gladiator—the very cleverest that we know, and perhaps the greatest master of his own special art of line-fence that the world has ever seen.

Swift.

Far otherwise must one speak of that great friend of his who has been mentioned once or twice already, but also far more shortly. The influence of Swift upon his own age, as far as literature went, was not very great; it has been generally if not invariably noted that the influence of the "world-writers" seldom is. And as he influenced it little, so he was in literature little influenced by it—a proposition which will not seem a paradox to anyone who examines the essence rather than the mere subjects and external forms of Swift's work. The greater part of that work, including almost everything by which he is now best known, except the "Tale of a Tub," the "Journal to Stella," and some of the best of the not highly poetical, but, as a rule, rather underrated verse, dates from the present time—from the Dean's Irish exile—when he had to fill his vacant hours, and, if possible, beguile with literature his immedicable resentment at fate. The "Drapier's Letters" have far greater attraction for the modern reader than his earlier political tracts, and, indeed, are in their way superior to everything except those of "Peter Plymley," who directly imitated them. These date from 1724, almost ten years after the death of Anne; for Swift had been earlier otherwise occupied, partly with the great Stella and Vanessa affair, with which we have nothing to do. Two years later, in the winter of 1726, appeared "Gulliver's Travels," the other main pillar, with the "Tale of a Tub," of the vast satiric temple of Swift's genius. After Stella's death in 1728 he took to light verse again, and some of his happiest things date from this period, when he was already sixty-one, and when the old

1742]

age of disease, solitude, and misery, which ended sixteen years later in madness and death, had already come upon him. His chief prose works during this latter time were the "Modest Proposal," the grimmest and most impeccable of his exercises in irony, the "Vindication of Lord Carteret," one of his best political things, the delightful "Polite Conversation" (the most good-humoured but one of the finest-flavoured of his satires on society), and the quaint, if rather unsavoury, "Directions to Servants." Of more than one of these, as of his earlier works, the exact date of composition is very uncertain. Swift, except when political interests were at stake, was utterly careless about his literary work, which he would allow to lie in MS. for years, and not infrequently gave to anyone who cared to take the trouble (and the profit) of printing it. It is not very uncommon to find persons who regard with incredulity and a sort of suspicion the species of awe with which nearly all the most competent critics (even those who, like Thackeray, are unjust to him in some ways) are wont to speak of "the Dean." These feelings will not, in the case of anyone not totally disqualified for appreciating greatness in literature, survive actual acquaintance with his work. It is, indeed, a long and not a very easy inquiry to determine the exact sources of the peculiar charmed sway which he exercises over the best minds; but they may be generally indicated as the combination in him of the wildest and most playful comedy with the sternest tragedy; of a grasp and comprehension of human folly, weakness, baseness, madness, which no man has ever excelled; of an unobtrusive but astonishingly perfect prose style suitable alike for argument, for narrative, for exposition, for invective, for light conversation and talk, and of a most strangely blended character. In Swift a rough and almost ferocious temper accompanied real kindness (even tenderness) and playfulness; parsimony was combined with generosity, ambition tempered by a total freedom from literary vanity or jealousy. Nor is the interest, even in persons little given to scandal, unconnected with the mysteries of his private life—mysteries which have attracted those who care very little as a rule for personal problems, and which, as it is pretty certain that they can never now be solved, are sure to retain their attraction.

The marvellous accomplishment of Pope and the mighty



Arbuth-  
not.

genius of Swift are attended, as frequently happens in literary history, by the lesser names of Gay and Arbuthnot, who play squire to their knight. The four were close literary and personal friends, and are grouped by one satiric touch in Swift's couplet on his own death and his friends' mourning. Arbuthnot's grief is there represented as being likely to prove the shortest; but he seems to have been in some ways the best man of the four, and he was certainly the most like Swift. Until Mr. Aitken some years ago extricated to some extent, and only to some extent, the separate work of Arbuthnot from the tangle in which it had hitherto lain with that of his friends, it was almost impossible,



Photo: Walker & Cockerell.  
JOHN GAY, BY SIR G. KNELLER.  
(National Portrait Gallery)


Gay.

and it is still very difficult, to distinguish it. As Swift says that Arbuthnot, and not himself, wrote "The Art of Political Lying" and "The History of John Bull," we must of course accept the statement; but without it one would have unhesitatingly attributed them to the Dean; and we may still be permitted to believe that his influence, if not his direct work, is largely represented in them. Gay is much less of a mere echo of Pope than Arbuthnot is of Swift. Born at Barnstaple, and of no regular education, he was, with the extraordinary luck which attended men of letters at this time, introduced when quite young to the society of the wits and the patronage of the great. Being of an amiably parasitic turn, he preferred this latter in the shape of actual homes (as secretary or something else) in noble families who petted him, to public office of any kind, and he died at forty-seven a guest of the Duke and Duchess of Queensberry. His literary work is about half way between Prior and Pope in character. It began with the *Shepherd's Week*, a batch of burlesque pastorals (in parody chiefly of Ambrose Philips), was continued by the very clever *Trivia* (on London streets), and the famous "Fables," which were immediately followed by the equally famous *Beggar's Opera*, a thing suggested—as the best things of Swift's friends generally were—by Swift. In these

things, and not a few lesser ones, the ease, wit, and neatness of Gay's muse are all conspicuous; but he has neither the most exquisite and airy touch of Prior's grace, nor the deeper note of Prior's rare humorous melancholy.

Some lesser poets, as before, must be passed over rapidly; Isaac Watts, whose hymns, famous in all memories as a name, are perhaps still not absolutely unknown as actual verse, while

**Minor  
Poets:  
Isaac  
Watts.**



ISAAC WATTS.

(By permission, from the Above Bar Congregational Church, Southampton.)

his elaborate and unintentionally humorous Pindaric odes have been read by very few, even among literary students; Allan Ramsay, a fair writer, especially in the rather overpraised "Gentle Shepherd," and Hamilton of Bangour, in Scotland; Malloch, or Mallet, a literary hack of some merit; John Byrom of Manchester, who contributed to the *Spectator*, and lived till well into the reign of George the Third—a Jacobite, a mystic, a shorthand pundit, a physician, and a very interesting person;

Savage, the Bohemian and vastly overpraised friend of Johnson's youth; Dyer, of "Grongar Hill"; Matthew Green, who wrote "The Spleen," a small but singularly pleasing production; and others to whom the respect of the eighteenth century for these poets of its own and the conservatism of school and other anthologies have given a longer life than most of them deserve, and who, in consequence, have been almost unjustly depreciated since, in revenge for the obscurity into which they threw for so long the far better minor poets of the seventeenth century. But two require some more substantive mention, inasmuch as though they represent much the same influences as those which worked on Pope, and were, to some extent, influenced directly by him, the difference of their tastes and idiosyncrasies reflected itself in the character of their work—in both cases highly remarkable work.

#### Young.

These two were Edward Young (1681–1765) and James Thomson (1700–48). Young, who was a very long-lived man, was born nearly twenty years before Thomson and outlived him nearly as long, so that he might, as far as mere birth-and-death dates go, have been treated of in the last chapter or postponed to the next. Moreover, his best work was not published till after the close of this present section. But in spirit, literary and personal, he belongs to the period of the two first Georges, if not even of Anne. He was a Fellow of All Souls, but—which was not common then in men who resided after their undergraduate days—he never took orders till he was about fifty. He obtained a college living, but no high preferment, to his great chagrin, though he stooped as abjectly as any literary flatterer even of his own day to gain the conquest to which his ambition soared. He had contributed to the Steele-Addison periodicals, and had published "The Last Day"—a gloomy mixture of rant, flattery, and power—in 1713. He tried the stage, and his *Revenge*, with its character of the Moor Zanga, retained a considerable success of esteem throughout the century. In 1728, before Pope had regularly settled down to social satire, Young issued "The Universal Passion," which was popular, and, in some ways, not inferior to Pope himself. Then for years he wrote appalling odes of a semi-political kind, which look like bids for the Laureateship. The famous "Night Thoughts" (the original first title of which was "The Complaint") did not appear till the very

last year of our period, and was even then not completed till two years later. He did nothing afterwards worth mentioning.

Meanwhile Thomson, a Scotch borderer of fair connections but small means, had come up, after the usual meditation *tenui avena* at Edinburgh, to London, and had published "Winter," his first "Season," in his six-and-twentieth year, a little before Young's "Satires." He was taken up by Pope's enemies, and was not at all discouraged by Pope himself, whose literary jealousy, irritable as it was, had, like Voltaire's, the odd quality of directing itself against his elders and inferiors rather than against younger men of merit. For three years more—omitting 1729—Thomson produced a "Season" a year; the complete set (which, however, was afterwards very much revised and enlarged) being issued in 1730. He travelled for some time as a tutor; but the grand tour entirely failed to yield the inspiration of his native heath, and "Liberty," its poetical result (1734-6), is one of the worst poems ever written by a really good poet. Duly furnished

Thomson.



JAMES THOMSON, BY WILLIAM AIKMAN.

(Scottish National Portrait Gallery.)

with patrons and a sinecure, he bestowed most of the energies of his not many remaining years on bad tragedies, finding time, however, for the exquisite "Castle of Indolence," the best poem written between Dryden and Blake, which appeared in the May, as its author died in the August, of 1748. It seems, however, that it had been written some fifteen years earlier, by which time, accordingly, Thomson's best work was done. It is in the Spenserian stanza, a metre utterly unsuited in appearance to the eighteenth century, and, as a rule, neglected

or completely misused by it, but here perfectly achieved with an original, not a mere parodist, variation.

Reaction  
from  
Pope.

There are two points—one of form and one of spirit—in which Young and Thomson are almost equally, though not diametrically, opposed to Pope. The point of form is that both have shaken off the tyranny of the couplet (Young could do it fairly, Thomson very ill), and have returned to blank verse as their chosen vehicle, and to variety of metre by way of pastime and tentative. The point of spirit is that both are once more romantic rather than classical in theme and treatment.

In their blank verse studies both had fallen back on Milton, not without a glance at the dramatists; but Young was somewhat more imitative than Thomson. The latter, it is quite clear, starts from "Paradise Lost." He has penetrated the secret of the verse-paragraph; he has borrowed many of the minor mannerisms; he has adopted (subject to the influence of two generations of reformed English) the classicalised vocabularies. But he has done more than this. He has put the *je ne sais quoi* of personality into his rhythm: so that Thomsonian blank verse is a kind in itself, and stands out among the non-dramatic kinds of the English unrhymed decasyllable as no others do but Milton's own and Tennyson's. Young, who tried more varieties and did not produce his most perfect blank verse till very late in life, has not gone quite so far nor done quite so much. He is not merely Miltonic, but he is not much more than Miltonic; and his inequality, in which respect he outdoes most English poets, is pervading. Every now and then he has a *greater* line than any Thomson can show. But in this respect, as in others, he is not so good an artist; he has a vastly less sure touch. Perhaps, however, his influence was even better. The blank verse of Thomson, like the couplet of Pope, is rather fatally perfect—it admits of little further variation. The ups and downs of Young tempt to progress.

There is more variety and more promise still in the rebellion in point of subject which both poets show. In Thomson it takes the path of the "return to nature"; in Young that of recoil upon the intimate and genuine thoughts and feelings of man. Both, no doubt, still exhibit the force of convention. The absolute veracity of Thomson's observation is conditioned by academic forms of expression: and the self-analysis of Young

shows something of the trammels of the theatre, the pulpit, the fashionable essay. But both have thrown off the yoke of "the town," of "the wits," of *das Gemeine*. Once more with them it is acknowledged, as it has not been acknowledged for a couple of generations, that man may be alone with Nature and with himself.

Almost all the writers mentioned in this chapter have been



*Photo: Walker & Coenert.*

HENRY ST. JOHN, VISCOUNT BOLINGBROKE, BY  
HYACINTHE RIGAUD.

(National Portrait Gallery.)

writers in verse, and only one of them, Swift, was a very great **Prose.** writer of prose; though Pope's letters are of excellent quality, and others wrote well. Indeed, it is curious at first sight that this "age of prose" should have attached a pre-eminent and almost exaggerated value to verse. Whether for this reason or for some other, its verse is certainly, on the whole, more noteworthy than its prose. Swift, indeed, would by himself suffice to fill any period, and he had a mighty supporter in Berkeley, the best writer of philosophical, and one of the best writers of

Theo-  
logians  
and  
Moralists.

any, prose in English. But Berkeley falls for treatment elsewhere (p. 80) with all the other philosophers and theologians whose studies absorbed so much of the intellect and literary gifts of the age. We thus miss Mandeville (p. 56), a master of rough, repulsive, but vigorous and idiomatic English, Dutchman as he was, and nearly as vivid a realist as Defoe; Shaftesbury, his elegant predecessor and provoker; the Deist crew who wrote and drew down on themselves the wrath of better writers than themselves: Leslie, the "Invincible Doctor" of later English controversy; Law, as stout a controversialist as he, and something more than a partisan; Bentley, Leslie's equal in profane and scholarly polemic; the rugged style but admirably lucid thought of Bishop Butler; the smooth, if treacherous facundity of Conyers Middleton: the ragings of the Bangorian controversy. Bolingbroke, perhaps, may be left us, but it is impossible to be very thankful for Bolingbroke. That he was a great orator seems certain, though we have, as in the case of all English Parliamentary orators till Burke, next to nothing to prove or disprove the fact. That in his brilliant youth he fascinated and dazzled men of letters, from Dryden to Pope, is unquestionable. That he must have had some strange magnetism, as after times have called it, to account for his triumph over the services of Marlborough, the prudery of Anne, the practised wiles of Harley, may be taken for granted. His own day thought him great as a master of philosophy and of style. But a famous sentence, "Who now reads Bolingbroke?" shows how soon this glamour lost its effect: and though several attempts (mostly due to the whimsical fancy of Lord Beaconsfield for him) have of late years been made to revive his fame, they have all failed. Nay, most of those who have begun to bless him have ended, if not exactly by cursing, yet with that faint praise the sense of which his adoring friend and bard knew so well. The fact is that whatever Bolingbroke may have been in his youth, before that Tory *débâcle* which his greed of power and party spirit did much to bring about, he was later very much of a sham. His Deism, picked up in France, was utterly shallow; his philosophy, in so far as it was not mere fashionable "philosophism," was shallower still; and his very style was pinchbeck; French polish, veneer—not true metal or solid wood.

Boling-  
broke.

A very different name is the one great one which we have

left to the last, that of Daniel Defoe. In some respects, no doubt, Defoe's political and even moral honesty stands but little higher than Bolingbroke's, while, even putting questions of politics and morality aside, and trying to forget the too certain fact that he at once took money from Tory editors to write Tory articles, and from Whig Ministers to make these articles as little hurtful to the Government as possible, his general tone of

Defoe.



DANIEL DEFOE.

(The "Jure Divino" Portrait, by Van der Gucht.)

thought is dull, Philistine, almost offensive. But in literature he is a very great man indeed. Born, as it is now said, in 1659, he fought for Monmouth's rebellion and began pamphleteering early, signalling himself in the time of William (with whom he was in favour) by prose tracts against the anti-Dutch temper of the House of Commons, and wooden though not weak poems against the "True-Born Englishman." The change of reign brought him into trouble in virtue of his "Shortest Way with the Dissenters"—a pamphlet against highfliers, in a highflying

His  
Political  
Works.



His  
Fiction.

tone—and his already-alluded-to “Review” was written under all sorts of difficulties. But with Harley his politics, queer as they were, were in some kind of sympathy, and from Harley he received considerable patronage, the most important part of which was a secret mission to work for the Union of Scotland. These employments were continued after the Hanoverian succession in the manner already described, the chief victim being the Tory printer, Mist, and his *Journal*. Up to this time, and a little later, Defoe’s astonishing literary activity had been chiefly devoted to political pamphlets in prose and verse and to a vast variety of miscellaneous literature. It was in his sixtieth year that he first began the wonderful career in fiction, pure or mixed, which has made his fame. It would be quite impossible here (and in view of the utter lack of real evidence it is doubtfully advantageous anywhere) to discuss the various hypotheses as to the exact basis of the productions which followed. As alternatives to what is, after all, perhaps the most probable, if at first sight the most surprising—that they were merely the result of an intense talent which had at last found its true way and sphere—it has been held, first, and most improbably, that Defoe got hold of finished manuscripts; secondly, that he worked a sort of literary manufactory with “Man Fridays” at command; thirdly, that he usually had some starting-point of text, written or oral, which he furbished up and amplified. However this may be, “Robinson Crusoe” appeared in 1719, and it is a most significant fact in the social history of literature, that either simultaneously with or very shortly after its appearance in volume it was published in parts. 1720 saw the appearance of “Duncan Campbell” (not quite a romance); of the astonishing “Memoirs of a Cavalier,” one of the most vivid and apparently genuine military histories ever printed; and “Captain Singleton,” a narrative of African exploration and piracy on the high seas, of which the first division is not only very striking in itself, but quite marvellously true to discoveries which have not been certainly made till within the last forty years, and which then could only have been arrived at by acquaintance with possible rather than certain Portuguese maps and manuscripts. 1721 saw nothing; but the next year was even more fertile in pure literary work than 1719, witnessing the publication of “Moll Flanders,” which has been called “the greatest example of pure

realism in literature," "The History of the Plague Year" (which, *mutatis mutandis*, may be classed with the "Cavalier"), and "Colonel Jack," portions of which are among the greatest things he has done. "Roxana," in 1724, was the last, and, taking it altogether, the worst of his novels, if we except the "New Voyage Round the World," which is a sort of weaker "Captain Singleton," and suggests, most strongly of all, mere bookmaking. He did much other work, and during the third decade of the century was a distinctly popular writer. Then, owing to causes very imperfectly known, he relapsed into trouble, lay in hiding from 1729 to 1731, and died on April 26th of the latter year in an obscure lodging near Moorfields.

The characteristics of this extraordinary family of unfathered fiction (for there is nothing like it earlier) have been much handled; but, with the exception of "Robinson Crusoe"—the delight of all worthy youth and the not infrequent pastime of worthy age—opinions have varied a good deal about its component parts. The great longwindedness, the frequently ignoble details, and the want of any distinct and coherent plot or even character in most have militated as much against them with some as their marvellous verisimilitude has attracted others. They do not seem to have had much direct literary influence; yet such a body of prose fiction had at no time been previously produced in English, and it could not but show the tendency of the time to the form. As for Defoe, no criticism of him in brief is possible. It may be said that a man who had written any one of at least a score of things that he has done, and nothing else, would have been regarded by any competent judge as ranking with the best "single-speech" author in our history.

Of the general tendency of the time, of which even Defoe in his obstinately prosaic character is a specimen, enough has been said in dealing with Pope—and of the rising if scattered counter-tendencies against it, enough in reference to Young and Thomson—to make only a few additional words of summary necessary here. Its "Augustan" character—like that, some may say, of other periods, including the first to which that name was applied—was chiefly limited to the perfecting of a very limited and special kind of literary form at the expense of higher qualities not merely of spirit, but even of form itself. The constant danger of monotony was so great that it was, as we

The "Augustan"  
Age of  
English  
Literature.

have seen, felt, if not distinctly faced at once. But this danger, as is the wont of dangers, brought certain flowers with it. No striving after perfection, however low a kind of perfection it may be—and though from time to time attempts are made to show that this was not low, they may be dismissed as mere juvenile paradox—is ever without “certain condolences, certain veils” to its lowness. The slightly narrow and conventional badinage of the essayists was redeemed not merely by an exquisite concinnity of expression, a great fineness of observation, but by a sound if not very acute sense, a pure if not very elevated morality, a wholesome, kindly spirit, which kept England throughout this century of plain thinking and high living from the mischiefs which waited on it in France and elsewhere. The satire and moralising of Pope, inferior to the work of Steele and Addison in healthiness and wholesomeness, displayed not merely an almost diabolic cleverness of craftsmanship, but a grace, an elegance, a completeness of air and atmosphere which were, if not angelic, at least sylph-like enough. This was the saving grace of the Augustans’ error, the solace of their sin.

**REGINALD  
HUGHES.**  
Painting  
and  
Sculpture.

GEORGE I., a small German despot, called by chance to the throne of free England, was not predisposed to foster anything whatever in a country which he hated, and in which he felt his stay to be precarious. Such taste for luxury as he had was formed on the model of his elderly enemy Louis XIV., and his palace at Herrenhausen, both in its live and dead ornaments, was a vulgar German travesty of Versailles. But neither in England nor in Hanover did he make any serious attempt to imitate the Grand Monarque in the intelligent patronage of art and artists. George came to the throne in 1714, a year in which at least one true artist, Richard Wilson, first saw the light. Joshua Reynolds was born in the tenth year of his reign; while 1727, the year of his death, was also the year of Gainsborough’s birth. But for this accident there is little to connect the first of the House of Guelph with English art, which was never more completely at a standstill than during his reign.

Of course, many artists of the preceding reigns worked on. Till 1723 the clever, swaggering Kneller continued to send out

1742]

Foreign  
Artists.

the uncertain manufactures of his studio, and the honest but uninspired Dahl painted steadily till the middle of the century. Indeed, the work of Dahl, as seen in the gallery at Petworth, was probably the most meritorious of the reign. Laguerre also, who had been the assistant and pupil, and finally the rival, of Verrio, continued to paint the sprawling saints of his master on the ceilings of the great. He was, in fact, chosen to decorate the inside of the Cupola of St. Paul's, although set aside in favour of a younger man. This man (Thornhill), born in 1676, was his junior by thirteen years. He was an Englishman of good family settled in the neighbourhood of Melcombe Regis. He succeeded Sir Christopher Wren as member for that borough, and was knighted in 1715. Like many of the English artists of the period, he was originally an amateur, and his deficient training was not counterbalanced by natural gifts. He was accused of employing "ghosts," particularly one Thomas Gibson, and he doubtless owed something to his assistance. He is remembered to some extent by his decoration of the dome of St. Paul's and the Hall at Greenwich, but chiefly owing to the fact that he was the friend and father-in-law of Hogarth. The commission for St. Paul's, given in the reign of Queen Anne, was, as we have said, destined for Laguerre, but was wrested from him by Thornhill, rather, it would seem, because he was something of a man of fashion than on any ground of superiority as an artist. Perhaps it was well, for if we were not to have the mosaics contemplated by Wren, at any rate Thornhill's *chiaroscuro* was better than Laguerre's colour. He was not without invention, of the large but insipid character, that perhaps finds its fullest expression in the work of Le Sueur. Thornhill's allegorical painting in the Hall of Greenwich Hospital most favourably gauges his talent. It is cold and pretentious enough: King William and Queen Mary, attended by Hymen and the Virtues, giving peace to Europe; Apollo driving among the Signs of the Zodiac; the four elements in the angles, and fancy portraits of astronomers between the colossal figures which support the balustrade. Young tells us

Thornhill.

"How Raffaele's pencil lives in Thornhill's hand"

—not, it may be assumed, with Raffaele's approval.

This was, as we have indicated above, rather an era of



SKETCH FOR THE PAINTED CEILING AT GREENWICH HOSPITAL, BY SIR JAMES THORNHILL.  
(*Victoria and Albert Museum.*)

1714-1742]

gentleman amateurs, but it must be admitted that they were mediocre artists. Of those who then flourished (if the phrase be permissible) the most important names are Jervas and Richardson. The former enjoyed the friendship of Pope, and gave him lessons in painting. He was repaid in the most fulsome flattery, for the poet ventured to write of his portrait of Lady Bridgewater (daughter of the great Duke of Marlborough):

"With Zeuxis' Helen thy Bridgewater vies."

Jervas.

A somewhat stronger artist was Jonathan Richardson, who "arrived" a little late, having been born in 1665. He became the pupil of Riley, and after the decline of Kneller and Dahl divided with Jervas the position of the leading portrait painter of England. Both Jervas and Richardson were men of literary tastes, and consorted with men of letters. Jervas translated "Don Quixote," and Richardson published essays on "The Whole Art of Criticism," on the "Theory of Painting," and various sketches of travel and notes on Milton. His daughter was married to Hudson, who had the honour of being the master of Sir Joshua Reynolds; and Reynolds, we know, had a high opinion, if not of Richardson's art, at least of his learning. His best-known portrait is that of Matthew Prior, the poet, now preserved in the Bodleian Library.

Richardson.

Among eminent foreigners who secured English patronage in this reign were the Dutchman Dietrich Netscher, the son of Kaspar; Balthazar Denner, of Altona, the most laborious of all painters of the human countenance; and Peter Tillemans, of Antwerp, who had much employment among the English aristocracy as a copyist, teacher, and painter of landscape. Zincke, a miniaturist and enameller of the school of Petitot, commenced his career in this reign, though his fame in England dates half a century later. Peter Monamy, too, repeated, and occasionally with quite extraordinary success, the touch of the sea-painters of the family of Vandevelde. For a year or too in this reign the famous Swiss—or rather Genevan—*pastelliste*, Leotard, was in England, and his highly elaborate and accurate, if rather monotonous, hand was not without influence on the English workers in pastel.

Other Foreigners.

Sculpture, even more than other branches of art, continued to depend on foreigners, though the home taste for monumental

Sculpture.

marbles never at any time quite died out. Among its most eminent professors in the last years of George II. were John Michael Rysbrach and Peter Scheemaker. The first-named was a Belgian, whose skill was at first exploited by the architect Gibbs, as Scheemaker's was by Kent. Both he and Scheemaker, who also came from the Low Countries, were thoroughly competent workmen, and both had considerable vogue. Another and a greater name is that of Roubillac, or Roubiliac, a native of Lyons. He executed several works in marble, characterised by a dignity and vigour rare in his age. Among these the monument to the Duke of Argyll, at Westminster, and to Sir Isaac Newton, at Cambridge, are the most celebrated. Another statue of his—one of Handel the composer, executed for Vauxhall Gardens—excited the enthusiasm and admiration of the sculptor Nollekens. He was at the head of his profession in England, and verily towers among the sculptors of this and, indeed, the succeeding reign, during the latter of which his most important works were executed.


F. J.  
CROWEST.  
Handel  
and  
English  
Music.

HANDEL stands the most remarkable musical figure of the eighteenth century. The son of a surgeon, he was born at Halle, in Lower Saxony, on February 23rd, 1685. His father did not intend him for a musician, and it was one of the favouring episodes leading up to his high summit of artistic fame that brought him into contact with his first music-master, Zachau, organist of Halle Cathedral. After a course of study and experience in Germany. Handel visited Italy, for he perceived that the Italian musical manner contained much that was akin to his own conception of art. It was, indeed, in the happy combination of the German and Italian styles that the secret of his subsequent grand success proved to exist. After three years in Italy Handel returned home, to become *capellmeister*—i.e. master of the band and music—to the Elector of Hanover, afterwards George I. This was in 1709. The following year Handel visited England, and, like many others before and after him, was favourably impressed with the musical prospects here. Italian opera was then the new thing, which by means of travelling companies was fast making its way over Europe. It had been introduced into England as early as 1706,

Handel's  
Earlier  
Career.







THE OLD EAST INDIA WHARF, LONDON BRIDGE.

*(By Peter Monamy. Victoria and Albert Museum.)*

[1742]

when *Arsinoe* was produced at Drury Lane Theatre, with English words. In the short space of fourteen days Handel composed *Rinaldo*, which was produced at the Haymarket Theatre on the 24th February, 1711. Although sneered at by *literati* and wits of the time, the public at large received



GEORGE FREDERICK HANDEL, BY ROUBILLAC.

(Windsor Castle.)

it with acclamation. *Rinaldo* had no new forms, but the beauty and originality of its music, together with the splendour of its decorations, created a great sensation. Undoubtedly it was the finest opera that had, up to that time, been produced on any stage. Its success decided Handel's future so far as his home was concerned; he determined to take up his residence

permanently in England. Musical art here was at low ebb. Elizabethan music was forgotten. During the Civil War the practice, as well as the material, of music had suffered (IV., p. 548). Nor did the Restoration period repair the mischief—since Church music of the French style and flimsy masques were little calculated to put music in England upon any sound footing. The conditions were singularly favourable, therefore, to Handel's abode here; and for seven years he found ample musical work at the Court and among the aristocracy.

**Handel's  
Operas.**

With the year 1721 Handel entered upon an undertaking which brought him prominently to the front in English musical matters, and led him, eventually, into becoming an important public man in English society, as well as a great figure between two rival factions of the operatic world. A section of the nobility decided to establish Italian opera here, and Handel was selected as conductor and manager for the venture, which was started at the Haymarket Theatre, under the unhappy title of "The Royal Academy of Music." Having engaged a company of Italian singers, which included Durastanti and an artificial soprano named Senesino—for men then sang the women's parts—Handel composed in quick succession *Radamisto*, *Muzio Scevola*, *Floridante*, *Ottone*, *Flavio*, *Giulio Cesare*, *Tamerlano*, *Rodelinda*, *Scipione*, *Alessandro*, *Admeto*, *Riccardo Primo*, *Siroe*, and *Tolomeo*—all of them operas on the sparse Italian model of the period. These works were more or less successful, but, despite Handel's industry and assiduity at composition, the operatic scheme did not prove a success. Handel had not been at the helm long before he had to encounter some of these shoals which embarrass every manager and *impresario*. Patrons and singers began to have whims and to show their tempers, and Handel, with his rough independence and want of respect, was not the man to tolerate much interference. His method was inartistic but thorough. "If you vill not sing vat I do write, I vill take you by ze vaist and throw you out of de vindow," was the kind of alternative with which he confronted those songstresses of his company who dared to disregard his wishes. Needless to say that such want of tact only hastened a climax, which was reached during the 1728 season, when a disgraceful public squabble between the singers Cuzzoni and Faustina—supported by their respective factions—took place

on the stage of the Haymarket Theatre. Then the company was dissolved.

The following year another scheme was afloat. Handel and Heidegger—known in theatrical annals as the ugliest man in



GEORGE FREDERICK HANDEL, BY SIR JAMES THORNHILL.

(Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge.)


Europe—co-operated and took the King's Theatre in the Haymarket. For this enterprise the persevering musician found new performers and composed new operas—*Lothario*, *Parthenope*, *Porus*, *Ætius*, *Sosarme*, and *Orlando*; but he seemed beset with opposition, which, growing stronger and stronger, forced

him to abandon the partnership. This was in 1734. Discouraged, but not defeated, the resolute musician ventured yet a third effort with opera—this time solely on his own account—despite a strong opposition of aristocracy and singers pledged to ruin him. He had fallen out with Senesino—one of those famous sopranist singers that figured in the opera performances of the time. Senesino was arrogant and imperious, but he was also the spoiled idol of the fashionable world; the rupture with Handel, therefore, meant mischief. The singer found many friends who demanded redress for him, but Handel positively refused. He swore that Senesino should never appear in his theatre again, and the irate musician kept his word. Senesino's friends, therefore, opened a new house for opera at Lincoln's Inn Fields. Journeying to Italy, Handel secured fresh artists and brought them to London, having, in the meanwhile, secured Covent Garden Theatre. He wrote new operas—*Semiramis*, *Arbaces*, *Ariadne*, *Pastor Fido*, *Dido*, *Berenice*, *Xerxes*, and *Alexander's Feast*; besides which he threw his whole energies, as well as his fortune, into the concern. Yet all failed. Disappointed, worn out in mind and body, and a bankrupt, Handel took refuge at Aix-la-Chapelle. This was in 1737.

His  
Failure.

Character  
of his  
Operas.

Handel wrote forty-two operas. Though they are marked by much that is truly Handelian, they are not structurally different from the Italian forms of the time. He was decidedly conservative in opera. Thus he followed the style of his predecessors in making the voice and the solos the sole features, but he introduced little or no reform. The article that he produced was exactly to the liking of the Italians, so that they styled him the "caro Sassone"—which was no small achievement for a German musician. If, however, there was no advance in opera form, the dramatic expression in these works far surpassed everything that had previously been attempted. In early opera expression and colour were conspicuous by their absence, but Handel put an end to this. *Rinaldo* eclipsed all previous Italian operas in its illustrative colouring, and this property, which emanated not from the singer nor scenic artist but from the composer, Handel maintained throughout all his writings for the stage. It was in the songs—not in the choruses, as in his oratorios—that his



SENESINO ON THE STAGE. (From a caricature of 1735)


rare genius was so apparent. Distinguished by masterly judgment in the expression of the words, combined with much melodic sympathy and pathos, the songs of these operas might be revived to-day—a few are—without fear of offence. Amid such an *embarras des richesses* it is difficult to make a selection; but such airs as “Caro vieni a me” (*Riccardo Primo*), which Signorina Cuzzoni used to sing; “Vieni torna Idolo mio” (*Teseo*), “Cuor di madre, E cuor di miglie” (*Sosarme*), “Bel piacer” (*Rinaldo*), and “Il tricerbero umiliato” (*Rinaldo*), show something of that freshness, feeling, symmetry, and adaptability for the voice which rendered them superior to everything that had preceded them. The free and descriptive accompaniments, too, were as new and remarkable as the songs themselves, and with many beautiful obbligato parts and choice devices for brass, reed, and string instruments, must have charmed listeners with whom such skilled and advanced orchestration was a novelty. Despite songs, orchestral accompaniments, and slight improvements upon existing methods, such as the introduction of a quartet in the third act of *Radamisto*; the two airs *in succession* given to the principal parts in *Teseo*—quite an unorthodox proceeding; despite the repeated proofs he gave of being a leader in opera, Handel could do nothing with it here. The bombast and exaggeration ill accorded with the national seriousness; thus the violent love-scenes, men singing women’s parts, the tragic methods—all fell flat with the English people. What they wanted was English opera, and Purcell they knew not. Handel failed in Italian opera, and his contributions to its *répertoire* are to-day no more highly regarded on the Continent than they are here.

Handel's  
Oratorios.

The world had not yet seen the true Handel. Recovering his health, his thoughts turned from secular to sacred art, for which his early training eminently fitted him. He had been brought up a Lutheran, and the circumstances into which he was thrown impressed him with the real and earnest in art. The noble language of the Bible, and its solemn truths, seemed to the master to be alone adequate to the mood in which he now was for composition. Hence arose those grand conceptions—the oratorios—which have immortalised his name, and with which he has exercised his vast influence upon musical England. The novelty of this sacred music consisted in the fact

1742]

that it was not for the church, as the oratorio had hitherto been, but was to be on such a scale as to be performed in the theatre. The master had prefaced his efforts in the direction of oratorio with two compositions—the *Johannis Passion* (1704) and an Italian oratorio, *La Ressurezione* (1708). Now



HANDEL'S HARPSICHORD.

(Victoria and Albert Museum.)

he was to engage upon those masterly examples of sacred art which at once gave him a place above all composers of the eighteenth century. *Saul* was composed and produced with marked success at the Haymarket Theatre in 1739; then, with that fecundity which is a sure sign of genius, Handel wrote *Israel in Egypt* (1739), the *Ode on St. Cecilia's Day* and *L'Allegro ed Il Penseroso* (1740), that king of oratorios—*The*



*Messiah* (1741), *Samson* (1743), *Joseph* (1744), *Judas Maccabæus* (1747), *Joshua* (1747), *Solomon* (1748), *Theodora* (1749), *Jephtha* (1751), and several others.

His Public.

These are the scores that have made Handel immortal. He did not invent the oratorio, since it had its origin in Italy; but he took it to that high point of perfection where it becomes the general goal of every great musician, and which one only—Mendelssohn—has seriously approached. It is amazing that such works should emanate from a man who was over fifty-four years of age; it is not less surprising, considering the strong opposition that existed among the aristocracy, that Handel was able to induce audiences to listen to, and to restore his lost fortune with, compositions which were not moulded for the habitual pleasure-seeker. But the master did not seek the ear of the aristocracy; he appealed to the great middle-class of England, and it was this public which then, as now, gave its approval to his sacred music—music which has revolutionised the whole musical thought and tendency of England. The intrinsic merit of Handel's oratorios is indeed considerable, but it is not altogether the composer's personality, nor the introduction of novel vocal and instrumental methods into them, which render them such abiding examples of art. Their reasonableness of construction, and the masterly combination of the German and Italian styles characterising them, constitute their chief feature outside their loftiness and beauty. For their predominating flavour Handel was wholly indebted to Purcell. The conception of the new scope for oratorio was a great thing, but it was more to make it artistically comprehensive and perfect. Several qualities served Handel. Up to his day the stern, severe, colourless style of Palestrina had reigned in sacred music for two hundred years. The only exception was the English School. Suddenly Handel burst in upon the musical firmament with all his wealth of colour and dramatic expression. This was an immense gain and meant a vast stride in music. His tone-painting was a revelation to the age which first realised it, and, while it lifted musical art over a gap of two centuries, it formed the starting point from which vaster results were to follow in works by Beethoven, Schumann, and others. Handel sought to represent such natural objects as the singing of birds, the flowing of fountains, etc., in his operas; but when we come to his

oratorios he is even more of an expressionist. His tone-painting extends to pictures like the sun standing still, the Red Sea cleft by a miracle, a darkness to be felt, etc. Every shade of expression can be found studded throughout his oratorios. There is page after page of matchless musical painting in *Israel in Egypt*, the Jupiter of oratorios; the local colour in the *Messiah*, and such beautiful and expressive pieces as "Deeper and deeper still," "Waft her, angels," "There were shepherds abiding in the fields," are well known to those who follow Handel's music. No piece of descriptive music has ever become so familiar, probably, as the "Dead March" in *Saul*. This great colouring gift—so admired, and so essential to make music the living power that it should be—Handel devoted to the art two hundred years ago. No wonder that he rose above all other musicians of his day and won the reputation of being indisputably the first musician in Europe. Nor is it surprising that his music is ever spreading and becoming more and more generally known; for it possesses living qualities which will ever keep it from growing antiquated.

Character  
of his  
Sacred  
Music.

Not less remarkable than the purely musical is the devotional aspect of the masterpieces of art which have won an undying fame for Handel. He was a great colourist, but his religious principles and promptings stood him in as good stead in the construction of his oratorios as did his genius, learning, and scholarship. Brought up amid the atmosphere of the *chorale*—the simple song of the Protestant Church in Germany—Handel was well equipped for evolving an art-creation—a grand development of the English anthem—that would appeal to the hearts and ears of the English people. This influence is the real secret of Handel's clear and simple style. His naturally serious temperament enabled him to deal with solemn things in a befitting spirit: he knew his Bible well, and in the absence of a librettist could construct his own books. In the case of *Israel in Egypt* it is generally supposed that he did.

Handel's orchestration was not in advance of its day, and to our modern ears necessarily sounds bald and scanty; hence the desirability of the additional accompaniments which Mozart, Mendelssohn, and other musicians have added to the master's oratorios in order to give them the advantage of instrumental support which Handel himself would probably have been the first to use had it been in existence. Among the radical changes

His  
Orches-  
tration.

marking the close of the eighteenth century, music became affected. Instrumental art began to dispute the field with vocal, and although Handel did not—he necessarily could not—do for orchestration what Mozart, Haydn, and Beethoven were able to accomplish, yet he advanced it considerably by his manner of using it. He did not increase the material of instrumentation, but his manipulation of it, his original as well as beautiful utilisation of the instruments, whether in *obbligato* accompaniment or in chorus, carried this phase of musical art far ahead.

No new musical forms can be credited to Handel, although he considerably advanced existing ones. Carissimi (1604–74), who lived and died before the composer of the *Messiah* was born, did much for recitative, the double-chorus, and instrumental effect in *Jonah*; yet all is as nothing compared with what the next comer, Handel, accomplished in his colossal choral conceptions. The choruses especially rise grandly over all similar forms of art; and although Haydn, Spohr, Mendelssohn, and lesser masters like Macfarren and Sullivan, have turned to oratorios, one only—Mendelssohn—has approached the grandeur and sublimity of Handel in the chorus. Such examples as the “Amen” and the “Hallelujah” (*Messiah*), “When his loud voice” (*Jephtha*), “Gird on thy sword” (*Saul*), “He spake the word” and “I will sing unto the Lord” (*Israel in Egypt*), with “The many rend the skies” (*Alexander’s Feast*), and numerous others, thoroughly represent the master. Their vastness, contrapuntal ingenuity, and descriptive character lift them above all else of their kind, so that whenever the word “chorus” is mentioned musically the mind invariably reverts to Handel. There is not one among the many which he has written that does not contain abundant evidence of theoretical power and skill, and yet there are no insuperable vocal difficulties; on the contrary, the great choral associations throughout the country sing Handel’s music better than any other—it being a secret with the master to create the most extraordinary choral effects by the simplest means. This simplicity always ends in sublimity; and ever present as it is in Handel’s oratorios, these works become the ideal of sacred musical art—matchless and unsurpassable. On the whole, then, we trace Handel’s great service to music, not to this or that invention in form or theory, but to the pure atmosphere which has grown out of the regular

1742]

performance of his oratorios. His music has raised the whole tone and character of the art, and has so permeated all classes that indifferent or vulgar music now has, happily, a poor prospect of being tolerated.



*Photo: York & Son, Notting Hill, W.*

MONUMENT TO HANDEL, WESTMINSTER ABBEY.

The great musician laboured in every field of music. Thus he was the ready and practical musician, knowing what people could sing, play, and what they liked. He became the teacher of queens, princes, and the nobility, while many a singer of his day benefited by his suggestion and instruction. As an organist he was unrivalled; and his performances, when blind, on the

instrument at the Foundling Hospital, "with all Heaven before his eyes," are historical matters in music. Morally he was as great as he was musically; and his charity and goodness of heart were unbounded. His musical influence it would be impossible to measure, since it is general rather than specific. It is, we repeat, the atmosphere surrounding Handel's music which has proved so beneficial to this country. Musicians and composers do not imitate Handel; he invented no forms and rhythms such as Mendelssohn has set to tempt copyists; he is not a composer who can be "cribbed" from without the certainty of detection. All is above all. It is the lofty sublimity, the simple grandeur, the overpowering truthfulness of every bar that the master has written, which, rising up about us, have become as natural to us as the air we breathe. This influence has educated us as to what good music is and must be to please the English people. This healthy state and musical perception have been brought about mainly by Handel's oratorio music, for which reason the master will ever stand as the great musical educator of our country. The effect of his music has been to make England what it is musically to-day; and, as in gratitude for all this, thousands of people go annually to his resting-place, in the Poets' Corner of Westminster Abbey, to pay silent tribute to the genius who, though dead, still speaks more and more triumphantly.

**R. E.  
PROTHERO.**  
**Agriculture,**  
**1689-1742.**

THE great changes which English agriculture witnessed in the course of the century following the Revolution may, roughly speaking, be identified with five names—Jethro Tull, Lord Townshend, Bakewell of Dishley, Arthur Young, and Mr. Coke of Holkham. To the efforts of these men were due the changes in farming methods which alone could have enabled the land of the country to support the struggle of the Napoleonic wars, and to meet the sudden demand for food of a manufacturing population that advanced in numbers by leaps and bounds. Through the improvements which these pioneers initiated, England provided bread and beef for the great centres of commercial industry that sprang up, as if by magic, at the close of the eighteenth century, at a time when it would have been impossible to obtain supplies from any other country. The history of only two of these founders of modern English farming, Jethro

Tull and Townshend, falls within the present period. But to understand the precise nature of the changes involved by a comparison of the agriculture of the seventeenth century and that of the present time, it is necessary to form a clear notion of the way in which the bulk of the soil was cultivated in 1689, and for nearly a hundred years later.

Vast tracts of country, which now are cultivated, then lay waste and unenclosed. Hainault and Epping Forests occupied a great part of the county of Essex; Hounslow Heath and Finchley Common were, as late as 1793, described as wastes fit only for Cherokees and savages; two years earlier, the weald of Surrey still bore evidence of its total desolation in the posts which stood across it as "guides to the letter carriers." If such was the condition of the neighbourhood of London at the close of the eighteenth century, it may be supposed that, a hundred years earlier, less civilised districts were yet more barren and uncultivated. Cambridgeshire and Huntingdonshire were still undrained. Robin Hood would have found his forest of Sherwood still covering the greater part of Nottinghamshire. Derbyshire was a black region of ling, and from the northern point of the county to the extremity of Northumberland—a distance of 150 miles—the traveller would, like Jeanie Deans, encounter nothing but wastes. In 1734 the forest of Knaresborough "was so thick with wood that he was thought a cunning fellow that could readily find out these Spaws" of Harrogate. The road from Beverley to Hull was marked out by willows, which showed above the swamp; at dusk the bells rang from Barton-upon-Humber to guide the traveller; from Sleaford to Brigg—but only after the year 1751—the land lighthouse of Dunston Pillar directed wayfarers across a solitary waste.

Aspect  
of the  
Country.

Of the cultivated land of England more than three-fifths was tilled on the open-field system—in village farms by associations of agricultural partners. Each of these village farms was practically isolated and self-supporting. Highway rates were unknown, and, except along the main arteries of communication, roads hardly existed. Wheeled carriages were, in country districts, scarcely ever used. The drift-lanes, more or less impassable, which communicated between the village and the cultivated land, and ceased when the bounds were reached, could only be called roads by an improbable courtesy. The inhabitants

Rural  
Life.

had little need of communication with their immediate neighbours, still less with the outside world. The fields and the live-stock provided the necessary food and clothing. Whatever wood might be required for building fences, or fuel, was provided on the wastes. Each village had its mill, generally the property of the lord of the manor almost every house had its oven and



DUNSTON PILLAR, NEAR LINCOLN.

brewing kettle. Women spun wool into coarse cloth; men tanned their own leather. Wealth only existed in its simplest forms, and natural divisions of employment were not made, because only the rudest implements of production were now used. The rough tools required for the cultivation of the soil, and the rude household utensils needed for the comfort of daily life, were made at home. In the long winter evenings farmers,

their sons, and their servants carved the wooden spoons, the platters, and the beechen bowls; fitted and riveted the bottoms into the horn mugs, or closed, in coarse fashion, the holes in the leathern jugs. They plaited the




Photo: F. Woolnough, Esq.  
HARVESTERS' LEATHER BOTTLE, 1757  
(Ipswich Museum.)

wicker baskets; fitted handles to the scythes, rakes, and other tools; cut the staves, and fixed the thongs for the flails; made the willow or ashen teeth for rakes and harrows, and hardened them in the fire; fashioned ox yokes and forks, racks and rack-staves; twisted willows into scythe cradles, or into the traces and other harness gear. Travelling carpenters, smiths, and tinkers visited farmhouses and remoter villages at rare

intervals to perform those parts of the work which needed their professional skill. But every village of any size found employment for such trades as those of the smith and the carpenter. Mean-

while the women plaited the straw for the neck-collars, stitched and stuffed sheepskin bags for the cart saddle, wove the stirrups and halters from hemp or straw, peeled the rushes for and made the candles. Spinning wheels, distaffs, needles were never idle. Coarse, home-made cloth and linen




Photo: F. Woolnough, Esq.  
SPINNING WHEEL.  
(Ipswich Museum.)

supplied all wants. The very names of spinster, webster, shepster, litster, brewster, and baxter show that women span, wove, cut out and dyed cloth, as well as brewed and baked for the household.



**The  
Open-Field  
System.**


Round each village lay the land, which the inhabitants cultivated in common on the open-field system, as members of a common household. as partners in a common venture. The average size of a single holding was eighteen acres of arable land, two acres of meadow, and common rights, over the common field and other commonable places, for forty sheep and as many cattle as the holder could fodder in the winter months. But each holding not only varied in size, but was cut up into minute, scattered, intermixed strips. One man might hold his portion of the soil as freehold, another as copyhold, another as a leaseholder for lives, another as a tenant for a certain length of time, from year to year, or at will. But whatever the tenure by which the land was held, the whole was farmed in common upon a system which, originating at a date before the Norman Conquest, in 1689 governed the tillage of, at least, three-fifths of the cultivated soil of the country, and though it gradually disappeared in the last three decades of the eighteenth century and the first half of the present century, yet survived in 1879.<sup>1</sup>

The land of the village farm consisted of meadow, arable land, and pasture. If an open-field farm in Wiltshire be taken as an example, it will be found that in shape it was generally long, narrow, and oblong, hemmed in between the downs and the stream, and often stretching three miles in length. At one end stood the cluster of mud-built, straw-thatched cottages, each with its yard, or small pasture, for horses, calves, or field-oxen. Sometimes these yards, or "garstons," were common to all the village tenants for rearing stock or for the oxen which could not "endure his warke to labour all daye, and then to be put to the commons or before the herdsman." In these enclosures, or "happy garstons," as they were called at Aston Boges, in Oxfordshire, were held the village merrymakings.

**The  
Meadows.**

In the lowest part of the land, if possible along the banks of the stream, lay the permanent meadows, or "ings," as they were often called. These meadows were fenced off in strips, and balloted for by the tenants, and held in separate ownership from Candlemas, or from Lady-day, to Midsummer Day, or hay harvest. As soon as the grass was mown and the hay carried, the meadows once more became open common pasturage, and so remained till they were once more allotted and put up for hay.

[<sup>1</sup> See the plan in Vol. I., p. 514, and the view in Vol. II., p. 135.]



PLAN OF PART OF AN OPEN FIELD.  
(Oriel College, Oxford.)

The  
Arable  
Land.

Beyond the meadows, and running up into the downs till the soil was too poor and steep for the plough, lay the three great tillage fields. Each year one of these bare, hedgeless fields was sown with wheat or rye. or with a mixture of the two, called "maslin": another was sown with barley, oats, beans, or pease; the third lay fallow. In this unvarying triennial succession the arable land was tilled and cropped. Each of the three fields was cut up into acre or half-acre strips, divided from each other by narrow, rough, bush-grown balks of unploughed turf. The complete holding of each village was so distributed that each man had a third of his holding in each of the three fields, and the three bundles of strips did not lie contiguously, but were so separated and intermixed that the good and the bad land was evenly distributed. Thus, suppose John Doe to hold eighteen acres of arable land, he would each year have six acres under wheat and rye, six acres under barley, oats, beans, or pease, and six acres fallow: and each of the bundle of strips would be so scattered that the tenant received his due proportion of the best and the worst soil. From seed-time to harvest the strips were fenced off for the benefit of the individual to whom they belonged. After the crops were cleared, the fences were removed, common rights revived, and the cattle of the village wandered promiscuously over the whole.

The  
Waste.

Beyond the meadows and the tillage lay the poorest and roughest land, which was left uncleared, affording in its native wildness mast and acorns for the swine, rough pasture for the ordinary stock, timber for building, fencing, and fuel; rushes, reeds, and heather for thatches, ropes, baskets, beds, candles, and a variety of other uses in the farm or the house. In these directions also lay the cow-downs and the sheep pastures. The herdsman and the shepherd were employed by the villagers to take care of their flock and herd. The rams and bulls were the property of the parish. Sheep were valued more for their wool than their mutton, and cows were chiefly kept for milk, breeding, or draught purposes. The common shepherd drives the sheep of the commoners to the downs, or folds them in the common fold upon the arable land, or, when they require to be fed, pens, and feeds them in separate lots, each commoner supplying the food for his flock. On the cow-downs the common herdsman tends the cattle of the community. They begin to

feed there in May, and continue to graze the downs till after the hay-harvest and after the arable fields are cleared of their crops. In the height of summer they feed in the small marshes by the river, or along the sides of the lanes, or tethered on the turt balks, and are only driven to the cow-downs after the evening milking. In the late summer they are turned in upon the aftermath of the hay-meadows, the haulm of the beans and pease, the stubble of the wheat, rye, oats, and barley. No winter keep was known to the open-field farmer. He turned a deaf ear, as has been said, to the suggestions of book-agriculturists. Consequently, it was only at the wane of the summer that his cattle were more than skin and bone. From Michaelmas onwards they steadily declined in condition, and only survived the winter in a state of semi-starvation. The roast beef of old England, for the enormous majority of the population, consisted of the worn-out oxen or the aged cows that were slaughtered in the autumn, when at their fattest, and salted for winter consumption. "For

Easter at Martylmas hang up a beef" is the advice of Tusser.

Such was the system in which the greater part of the cultivated land of the country was tilled in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The defects of it are sufficiently obvious. Unless the whole body of farmers agreed together, no individual could move hand or foot. It would be financial ruin for any member of the community to grow turnips or clover for the benefit of his neighbours. No winter crops could be grown so long as the arable fields were subjected to common rights of pasture. The land was wasted in innumerable footpaths and balks. The strips were too narrow to admit of cross-harrowing or cross-ploughing. Farmers spent their whole day in visiting



LAND-SURVEYING.

(Oriel College, Oxford.)


**Economic  
Defects  
of the  
System.**

the different parcels of which their holdings were composed, and their expenses in reaping and carting were immensely increased by the remoteness of the different strips. Drainage was impossible, for if one man drained his land or scoured his courses, his neighbour blocked his outfalls. Consequently, the arable land was rarely cleaned: it was choked with docks and thistles, overrun with nettles and rushes, pitted with wet places, pimpled with ant-hills and mole-heaps. Litigation was perpetual when it was so easy for men to plough up the common balks or headlands, remove their neighbours' landmarks, or poach their land by a turn of the plough, or filch their crops when reaping. As long ago as Piers Plowman there had been complaints against reapers reaping their neighbours' ground, and in Robert of Brunne's "*Handlyng Synne*" there is a reference to the false "husbands" that "ere [plough] awaye falsely mennys landys." The manure of the live stock of the village was wasted by the immense area over which the animals travelled. The promiscuous herding of the sheep and cattle generated every sort of infectious disorder. The scab was rarely absent from the common-fold, or the rot from the ill-drained field. No individual owner could improve his own live-stock when all the half-starved, diseased cattle and sheep of the village were crowded together on the same commons. Moreover, from the productive point of view, the wastes and commons were a standing reproach to the rural economy of the country, and were capable of being turned to more profitable account in the hands of enterprising individuals than under the common control of a large body of ignorant, prejudiced, and suspicious co-partners.

Scottish  
Agri-  
culture.

The general description which has been given applies to almost every part of the country. Scotland formed no exception to the rule. Scottish farmers, who are now reckoned among the most skilful, were, in 1689, inferior to those of England, and their methods of raising crops had remained unchanged since the Battle of Bannockburn. Alexander Garden, of Troup, describes the system which was followed in 1686. The land was divided into in-field and out-field. The in-field was kept "constantly under corne and bear, the husbandman dunging in every thrie years, and, for his pains, if he reap the fourth corne he is satisfied." The out-field was allowed to grow green with

weeds and thistles, and, after four or five years of this repose, was twice ploughed and sown with corn. Three crops were taken in succession, and then, when the soil was too exhausted to repay seed and labour, reverted to its thistles and weeds. Sir Archibald Grant of Monymusk in Aberdeenshire says that, in 1716, turnips grown in fields by the Earl of Rothes and a few



WEIGHING MACHINE, SOHAM, CAMBS.

others were objects of wonder, that except in East Lothian no wheat was grown, that there were few enclosures, no repaired roads, few wheel-carriages. On his paternal estate

“there was not one acre enclosed, nor any timber upon it, but a few elm, sycamore, and ash about a small kitchen-garden adjoining the house, and some struggling trees at some of the farm-yards, with a small copse-wood, not enclosed, and dwarfish, and browsed by sheep and cattle. All the farms ill-disposed and mixed; different persons having alternate ridges; not one wheel-carriage on the estate, nor indeed any one road that would

allow it. The whole land raised and uneven. and full of stones, many of them very large, of a hard iron quality, and all the ridges crooked in shape of a S, and very high and full of noxious weeds. and poor, being worn out by culture without proper manure or tillage. The people poor, ignorant, and slothful, and ingrained enemies to planting, enclosing, or any improvement or cleanness."

Reform  
Begins.

The state of agriculture revealed in this passage is as bad or worse than that of England. But in both countries improvements were at hand, and from the same sources. Donaldson, whose "*Husbandry Anatomised*" (1697) is, as has been said, the first Scottish work on agriculture, did not indeed expect that the improvements which he recommended would be taken up by tenants. People will, he says, probably answer him with "Away with your fool Notions; there are too many Bees in your Bonet-case; we will satisfie ourselves with such Measures as our Fathers have followed hitherto." Both in Scotland and in England it was, in fact, idle to expect that the open-field farmers, or the rack-rented tenantry, or even the leaseholder for lives, would initiate changes in the cultivation of the soil. Nor would the small freeholders or the yeomen be likely to attempt alterations in the agricultural methods of their forefathers which, in a single season, might bring them to the verge of ruin. It was in both countries the large landlord who took the lead in the agricultural revolution of the eighteenth century. But towards the close of the period, the new markets created by the sudden development of manufacturing industries convinced every sensible farmer that the shortest road to wealth was to turn the primitive self-sufficing farms into manufactories of bread and beef. Under the pressure of necessity, enclosures (both of uncultivated land and of open-field farms), reclamation of wastes, partition of commons, large farms, long leases, capitalist landlords and farmers, and scientific husbandry convulsed rural society, and absolutely revolutionised its general aspect. The extinction of the commoner, the small freeholder, the small farmer, and even the yeoman was the price which the nation paid for food for its manufacturing population.

An Agri-  
cultural  
Revolu-  
tion.

Jethro  
Tull.

The part which Jethro Tull played in this great change was rather theoretical than practical. But the principles which he laid down in his "*Horse-Hoeing Husbandry*" (1733) were the principles on which the agricultural revolution was based. He

was the "greatest individual improver" that British agriculture ever knew, and by his determination, enterprise, sagacity, observation, and inventive faculty anticipated most of the results of modern scientific farming. Born in 1674, he matriculated at St. John's College, Oxford, in 1691, and studied the law in



JETHRO TULL

*(By permission of the Royal Agricultural Society.)*

London. In 1693 he made the grand tour of Europe, everywhere noting the methods, products, and implements of foreign agriculture. In 1699 he married, and settled down on a farm near Wallingford, which he inherited from his father. This he subsequently sold, and the bulk of his valuable experiments were carried out at Mount Prosperous, in Berkshire, where he



died in 1740. Here he experimented in the depth of soil with which seed should be covered, was careful in selecting, cleaning, and changing his seed, and invented a drill which deposited the seed in furrows instead of scattering it broadcast by hand. Studying the growth of plant life, he discovered that the more the soil is worked and stirred the more freely do the roots obtain the organic elements of vegetation. On this principle he drilled his wheat and turnips in ridges, with wide spaces



PROSPEROUS FARM, BERKSHIRE.

between, which he horse-hoed, stirred, and pulverised in order to extend the food range of his growing crops.

**Landlords  
as Re-  
formers.**

On his own land Tull's experiments were successful. But on the old open-field farmer, who knew nothing of the value of the choice, and selection, and cleansing of seed, and who sowed broadcast at varying depths, they were entirely lost. Equally fruitless, so far as his immediate neighbours were concerned, was his demonstration of the advantages of turnips and of the drilling and horse-hoeing of roots and wheats. It was not till Tull's principles were put in practice by large

landlords that their full results were illustrated. This was the work of men like Lord Townshend in Norfolk, Lord Ducie, Lord Halifax, or the members of the Scottish Society of Improvers in the Knowledge of Agriculture (p. 143), under the leadership of Lord Cathcart and Mr. Hope of Rankeilor. But the inventive genius of Tull, and his discovery of the true principles of a practical and rational agriculture, give him a conspicuous place among the pioneers of British farming.



CHARLES, SECOND VISCOUNT TOWNSHEND.

(After the painting by Sir G. Kneller.)

Charles, second Viscount Townshend, may be taken as a **Townshend** type of the reforming landlords who now assumed the lead in agricultural improvement. Born in 1676, he died in 1738, having succeeded to the title and estates of his father when a child of ten years old. As a politician he played a prominent part in the history of the country at a critical period (p. 2). Lord Privy Seal under William III., he served as a Commissioner to treat for the union of England and Scotland, and, as a joint plenipotentiary with Marlborough, signed the Peace of Gertruydenberg in 1709. In the same year, as Ambassador

at the Hague, he negotiated the famous Barrier Treaty. Under George I. and George II. he acted as Secretary of State, as Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, and, as joint Secretary of State with Walpole, directed the foreign policy of the country.


In 1730 Lord Townshend retired from political life to Rainham, in Norfolk. There he devoted himself to the care of his estates, experimenting in the farming practices which he had observed abroad, and devoting himself, above all, to the field cultivation of turnips and improvements in the rotation of crops. He reintroduced the ancient, but almost obsolete, practice of marling the light lands of Norfolk; he encouraged and advocated enclosures; and, following the lines laid down by Jethro Tull, drilled and horse-hoed his turnips instead of sowing them broadcast. He was an exponent of the maxim that "The more the irons are among the roots, till the leaves spread across the rows, the better." He was also the initiator of the Norfolk, or four-course, system of cropping, in which turnips, grasses, and cereals were judiciously alternated. The introduction of green crops saved the farmer from the necessity of leaving a portion of his holding in unproductive fallow, and taught him to observe what, in the absence of chemical manures, was the golden rule of never taking two corn crops in succession from the land. The winter-keep, thus provided, enabled him to carry more stock, and gave him more manure, enriched the soil, trebled the yield, and verified the proverbial saying that "A full bullock-yard and a full fold make a full granary."

So zealous was Townshend's advocacy of roots as the pivot of agricultural improvement, that he gained the nickname of "Turnip" Townshend, and supplied Pope with an example for his Horatian Illustrations—

"Why, of two brothers, rich and restless, one  
Ploughs, burns, manures, and toils from sun to sun;  
The other slights, for women, sports and wines,  
All Townshend's turnips and all Grosvenor's mines,  
Is known alone to that Divining Power  
Who forms the genius in the natal hour."

Townshend's efforts to improve his estate were richly rewarded. On the light sandy soil of Norfolk his methods of farming were peculiarly successful. The furze-capped warrens, where "two rabbits fought for every blade of grass," were in a

few years converted into tracts of well-cultivated and productive land. Landlords and farmers who adopted his system realised fortunes. In thirty years one farm rose in value from £150 a year to £800; another, rented by a warrener at £18 a year, was let to a farmer at £240; a farmer named Mallet made enough off a holding of 1,500 acres to buy an estate of the annual value of £1,800. Young, writing in 1760, thus describes the effect of Townshend's husbandry on a district near Norwich:



RAINHAM HALL, NORFOLK.

“Thirty years ago it was an extensive heath without either tree or shrub, only a sheep-walk to another farm. Such a number of carriages crossed it, that they would sometimes be a mile abreast in pursuit of the best tract. Now there is an excellent turnpike road, enclosed on each side with a good quick-set hedge, and the whole laid out in enclosures and cultivated in the Norfolk system in superior style. The whole is let at 15s. an acre, ten times the original value.”

TRADE jealousies had always been strongly marked in England, but throughout the first half of the eighteenth century they became more prominent than ever; the wars of William and Anne had been costly, and by the new financial expedient of a national debt (Vol. IV., p. 719) payment was spread indefinitely


G. TOWNE  
END  
WARNER.  
The  
Progress  
of Manu-  
facture.

over the future, instead of being made at the time. Consequently, there was a general increase of taxation. Ministers had to raise money somewhere; and while artisans were so little able to make themselves felt in Parliament, trades were naturally often chosen to pay. The effect of this was twofold: trades became increasingly jealous one of another, and increasingly political; and secondly, trade writings and figures became more and more partisan and untrustworthy. To us who are accustomed to regard statistics as more or less identical with facts, there is something strange in the idea that it is as vain to expect accuracy and impartiality in a trade pamphlet of 1715 as in the political leader of a newspaper of to-day. Each is written in a partisan spirit, in order to make out the best case possible for the side. Official statistics of the time were trustworthy enough, but almost all others were collected with a purpose, and must be discounted. Trades defended themselves from taxation variously. One method was to make themselves out as large as possible; to put out an extravagant estimate of men employed, all of whom had large families, dependent on the trade for a livelihood; to say the menaced trade was the second in the kingdom; to urge that the materials used already pay duty, and make a touching appeal on the ground of the widespread ruin that would follow a tax. Another was to say the trade was small and young, a delicate child, struggling hard against foreign competition; that the return from the tax would be very small, and the expense of collecting it so great that all profit would be swallowed up. Was it, then, worth while to ruin a trade for so little? On one thing the trades were touchingly unanimous, each saying that someone else was a more proper subject for taxation than itself. For example, the glassmen said they lost much by breakage, but why not tax coal? The coal-owners drew a harrowing picture of an empty hearth, but why not tax linen? The linen men, principally Scots, appealed to the Act of Union on their own behalf, but a tax on alehouses seemed to them highly desirable. This brought the publicans and brewers up in arms, and so the game went on—wool, silk, calico, earthenware, iron, land, all arguing for their different interests and blind to the good of the public. Nowhere is the difficulty of a Protective system more clearly shown.

Thus trades were in reality much more prosperous than they

wished to appear. In particular, the silk industry was doing well. Silk weaving was well established, and by the enterprise of Sir Thomas Lombe silk spinning was introduced from Italy.

The Silk  
Trade.



A SILK-SPINNING MILL.

(V. Zonca, "Nuovo Teatro de Macchini ed Edificii," 1607.)

Sir Thomas was the son of a Norwich weaver, but he moved to London and was admitted a member of the Mercers' Company in 1707. Struck by the fact that organzine or silk thread had

to be imported from Italy, he persuaded his half-brother John to go there and learn the secrets of the trade. The story is that John's journey was full of adventure; the jealousy of the Italian craftsmen compelled disguise and strict secrecy. John, in fact, was a spy in an enemy's country. He was successful in his task, and returned to England bringing some Italian workmen and drawings of the machinery used. With regard to the latter, it seems that John's trouble was superfluous, for a very complete description of this machinery had been published by V. Zonca in 1607 and 1621; while in 1692 some persons had petitioned, unsuccessfully, to be incorporated into an English silk-winding company. But the workmen were probably the real treasure. In 1718 Sir Thomas obtained a patent for three engines—one to wind the finest raw silk, another to spin, and another to twist into organzine. In 1719 this machinery was set up at Derby on an island in the Derwent, and the business developed rapidly, in spite of John Lombe's death in 1722. By a writer of a later date the sad event was attributed to a slow poison given by some enraged Italian workmen who came to England for the purpose. This story, though picturesque, is untrue. In 1732 Sir Thomas's patent ran out, and he applied to Parliament for an extension, on the ground that he had been put to great expense in training workmen, and that the Sardinian Government had, in revenge, prohibited the export of raw silk. It was also shown that by his enterprise silk-thread was 5s. per lb. cheaper, and England was becoming independent of Italian organzine. His application was opposed by petitions of the mohair, cotton, thread and worsted spinners of Manchester, Macclesfield, Leek, Blackburn and Stockport, who wished to apply his machinery to their own trades, and also by the Corporation of Derby, on the curious ground that his invention decreased the wool trade, and that although it employed the poor it kept them at home, and eventually threw them on the rates. Finally, the extension was refused, but £14,000 was voted to Lombe for a compensation.

British  
Silk-  
worms.

Less fortune attended the attempt to produce raw silk in England. In 1718 a patent was granted to John Apletre to manage and produce raw silk of the growth of England. His prospectus asking for a capital of £1,000,000 argues in favour of home produce, points out that young ladies often keep silk-

worms for pleasure, and that it was easy enough to grow mulberry trees. This was all true enough, but the projector did not reckon with the climate. A plantation of silkworms was made in Chelsea Walled Park, and the apparatus included an evaporating stove, and "a certain Engine called the Egg Cheste"; but the whole scheme naturally ended in failure. England, as before, got silk from abroad, the annual import being, in round numbers, 2,500 bales brought by the Turkey Company, 1,300 from Italy, and 850 from India, each bale weighing 160 lb.

The woollen trade easily maintained the first place among English industries. Its progress was steady rather than striking, and it was watchful against new trades that might harm it. Thus the weavers opposed Lombe; they opposed English linens because these ousted German linens, and so Germany would have nothing to offer in exchange for English woollen goods; they strongly supported the Bill of 1720 directed against printed calicoes (p. 185); they complained that wool was run or smuggled out of England, whereby the price of the raw material was enhanced, and foreign weavers robbed English weavers of part of their work. Government treated the trade kindly. Laws were made strict against running; dyes for the wool could be imported free of duty; the growth of madder in England was encouraged, and the duty was taken off Irish wool. Haynes calculated that to make up a pack of wool (240 lb.) into fine stuffs, serges, and callimancoes would employ for one week 302 persons—viz. 7 combers earning £3 10s., 250 spinners earning £18, 20 throwers and doublers earning £5, and 25 weavers earning £12. This table brings out a fact which became of increasing importance—the excessive labour spent on hand spinning; ten spinners were required to keep up with one weaver, and the rate of wages was very low. But then spinning was a bye-industry largely practised in agricultural districts by women in the evening after their day's work was over. In fact, the difficulty of getting yarns was the main hindrance to rapid progress in woollen industries. Between 1718 and 1724 the average export of woollen goods was £2,932,881; between 1738 and 1742, £3,500,619.

**Woollens.**

Of the other textile industries linen was progressing steadily. Scotland and Ireland continued to be the chief homes of the

**Linen.**




business, but in 1740 the English industry was said to be little inferior to the Scotch. In 1731 England imported 3,891,573 yards from Scotland, and from Ireland 4,081,394 yards: in 1739, from Scotland 4,801,537 yards, and from Ireland 6,590,084. This seems to show that the Irish industry was growing the faster of the two. There was a continued jealousy felt of the Scotch, who in their turn complained that their trade was much injured by chequered and striped linen made in Spitalfields. All the linen makers were alarmed by the Bill of 1720, but the blow fell on the calico trade alone. Dyed and printed calicoes were forbidden, and wearers of suspicious materials arrested and, if need be, punished. After 1736, colour printing, however, was allowed in linen goods and cotton goods made with a linen warp. Of minor industries, lacemaking claimed, when resenting a proposed tax, to be the second trade of the kingdom, but its importance was much overrated. It was, however, widely spread and largely practised as a bye-industry. The framework knitting was centring more and more round Nottingham and Leicester. In 1727 there were 2,500 frames round London, and 5,500 in the provinces. In 1730 the first cotton stockings were made, and in 1740 the sliding tuck-presser was invented. English stockings were in request on the Continent. The trade was much engaged in quarrels at home, some masters taking too many apprentices, and thus giving no opening for journeymen. Two London masters kept respectively twenty-three and forty-nine apprentices. The Company of Framework Knitters tried repeatedly to reform these abuses, but without success. Gold and silver thread employed considerable numbers in London. At the beginning of the reign of George I. the parish of St. Giles, Cripplegate, contained eighty-five sheds for spinning gold and silver thread; 1,275 parish boys and girls were employed; there were 118 master wiredrawers, 106 master weavers of gold and silver lace fringes, besides a great number of silver and gold bone lace makers, button makers, windsters and flatters of gold and silver, and engine spinners, but the wages paid were very low.

Lace, and  
Minor In-  
dustries.

Hardware.

The most noticeable advance in the hardware trades falls so late in this period that its effect was hardly felt. In 1742 Thomas Bolsover, of Sheffield, who was repairing the handle of a knife, part silver and part copper, was struck with the idea of



SHEFFIELD IN 1712.

making plated goods. He confined himself to small articles, such as buttons and snuff-boxes; but another cutler of the same town, Joseph Hancock, applied the idea to candlesticks, teapots, and other things: but the development of this branch of the trade in Sheffield and Birmingham belongs properly to the next period. As copper and brass could be worked with coal, they were free from the difficulty which beset the iron trade, namely, want of fuel. Wood, in 1720, had good copper and lead mines, and the best conveniences for making brass, ingots, battery kettles, hammered plates, and wire; a number of persons were employed in raising copper ore in Devon and Cornwall, and the manufacture of brass was said to employ 6,500 families.

**Iron.**

The iron trade was almost stationary. Fuel was getting more scarce and more expensive: the output of English pig iron was not enough to supply our wants. It was frequently desired to admit American pig iron, but English ironmasters strongly opposed this. By an Act of 1719 the iron manufacture in America was practically suppressed. Swedish pig iron was imported, as it was found to be best for making steel. From 1711-18 the import of iron was 15,642 tons; from 1729-35, 25,501 tons; while the exports for the same periods were 4,365 and 5,334 tons respectively. In 1740 there were only fifty-nine furnaces in England with an output of 17,350 tons, an average of 294 tons each; the chief output was from Cheshire, Gloucestershire, Hereford, Salop, Worcestershire, Sussex, and Yorkshire. Sussex had the most furnaces—ten—but the output was lowest, averaging only 140 tons; in Cheshire there were three furnaces, but they were in full work, and turned out 570 tons each. As wood became more dear the ironmasters turned anxiously to coal, that is in the shape of coke, for raw coal seemed hopeless. Indeed, when writers of the time speak of smelting with "pit-coal," coke is meant. Dudley, whose attempts have been mentioned (Vol. IV., p. 609), almost certainly used coke, and not raw coal. Abraham Darby, of Coalbrookdale, used coke for his furnaces. He was also the first to get a satisfactory way of casting iron. He and a boy in his employment were watching some attempts in this direction made by Dutch founders, when the boy said he thought he saw where the others failed. Darby and he tried his idea, and Darby patented in 1708 a new way of casting iron in sand without loam or clay. What the improvement was it is

**Smelting  
with Coal.**

**Darby.**


1742]

Wood.

difficult to say: whether it was the use of sand alone, or the making of better air-holes. In any case, the plan remained for a long time a trade secret at Coalbrookdale. Abraham Darby the elder died in 1717, and his son and namesake took up the management of the works in 1730. He is sometimes said to have discovered the use of coke for smelting; but it is certain that coke had been used by his father. The son used it extensively, however, and made a practical success of it. But the maximum of noise with the minimum of result came from William Wood (p. 224). Besides the copper and brass business mentioned above, this person in 1720 had a lease of all the mines on Crown lands for thirty-nine counties: he boasted that he had the best ironworks, forges for refining and drawing iron out into bars, a slitting mill and furnaces for making pig iron, rails, banisters, backs and hearths for chimneys, etc. He also proposed to lease vacant land and grow cordwood thereon for fuel. Fuel must have run scarce, however, for in 1726 Wood was at Whitehaven talking of 100 furnaces worked with coal, and proposing to make incredible quantities of iron. He contracted to deliver 10,000 tons per annum to the Mines Royal Company at £11 and £12 the ton. In 1729 eleven furnaces were set up, but all the iron made was worthless. Eventually ten tons were consigned to the Company, but they would permit no trial to be made of its quality. Several trials were made at Frisington by experts, with the result that the iron was proved to break on the second or third heating. Wood did produce about six tons of good iron, but this was made at Russell's wood charcoal forge. A derisive person issued a prospectus purporting to come from Wood, saying that the operators had met with infidels at Frisington, and were now coming to London to exhibit his inventions. The public were invited to witness Wood's excellent method of pulverising iron ore and mixing it with coal, and making the result into bar iron which breaks at the first heating, and to subscribe £1,000,000 for shares; forty per cent. would be given for prompt payment, and "Mr. Wood's Irish halfpence taken, but no discount would be given on them." The difficulty in using coal was the more to be regretted, as the output of coal was increasing and the price falling. It was more used in houses, and in brick and tile, glass, lime, copper and brass works.

**Glass.**

Considerable activity was also shown in glass. The trade had much resented a tax in William III.'s reign, but it does not appear to have suffered. Bottles, flint glass, crown glass, plate and coach glass, window glass, and glass for the table, were all made in considerable quantity. One firm of glass makers were said to have 20,000 dozen bottles in hand. The ordinary price of bottles was 3s. per dozen quarts, and 2s. 6d. for pints. There were over sixty glass houses in England. If we may judge by



GLASS-MAKING IN 1747.

(*"Universal Magazine,"* Vol. I.)

Haudicquer de Blancourt's book on glass, translated from the French in 1699, a fairly wide knowledge was accessible, for the book, besides describing in full all ordinary glass work, gives instructions for making coloured glass with zaffer, manganese ferrelto, crocus martis, crocus veneris, and all sorts of colours—gold, yellow, garnet, amethyst, sapphire, velvet black, milk white, marble, peach colour, deep red, pearl colour, viper, ruby, topaz, opal, and sunflower.

The china and earthenware trades were chiefly carried on around Burslem, though the Chelsea works, with its beautiful

(1742)

china, and the "New Canton" factory at Bow, began to work during this period.

At Burslem, Thomas and Ralph Toft turned out some fine plates, which generally bear the maker's name. In 1720 Astbury began the use of flint: in 1724 Redrich and Jones brought out a new method for staining, veining, spotting, clouding, damasking, and imitating porphyry. Benson made an improved machine for grinding flints in water by iron wheels, and thus saving all dust; and in 1733 Shaw obtained a patent for employing various sorts of minerals, earth, clay, and other earthy substances, "to make up a fine body whose outside will be of a fine chocolate colour striped with white and the inside of white."

Ceramics.



WOODWARD, IN CHELSEA  
PORCELAIN.

By his peculiar ware Shaw made much money, but he ruined himself by jealousy of other potters, for, in bringing an action to protect himself, it came out that his secret was to wash the inside of the cup, and make lines on the outside with a thick slip of flint and pipeclay. The essential thing was the use of flint, Astbury's old discovery, and so the judge held that Shaw's patent was void. He gave the case against him, and, to the general joy of the trade, dismissed them with the words, "Go home, potters, and make what pots you please." Coarse earthenware, drainpipes, tiles, and the old butter pots were also made in quantities, but there is no other novelty to be remarked.



KITTY CLIVE, IN CHELSEA  
PORCELAIN.

(Victoria and Albert Museum.)

THE history of England in the eighteenth century is, in great degree, a commercial and economic history. The Spanish Succession War ended in a

A. L.  
SMITH.  
The Taxes  
and the  
People.


commercial treaty. The Seven Years' War, which created the expansion of England, has been rightly called a commercial war. The Napoleonic war itself was at bottom a commercial struggle. What is broadly true of the whole century applies still more exactly to the years of peace, 1713-39. The social history of those years might be described as the rivalry and gradual reconciliation between the old "landed men" and the new "monied men." In religious history the practical toleration of Dissenters from 1727 represents their rise to wealth. Even in literary history the same fact is seen. Pegasus is found harnessed to the car of commerce. Swift and Defoe and Addison did some of their most effective writing on subjects of currency, loans, and credit. In politics the Whig rule was a rule of capitalists. The great events of the period are the firm hold acquired by the Bank and the new East India Company, the convulsion of the South Sea scheme, the sharp lessons on credit taught by the Bubble Companies, the reform of the tariff, the settlement of the National Debt, the foundation of the sinking fund. Even the outburst of war which began to break up the period in 1739 would have been impossible but for the merchants being now eager to wrest from Spain by force what they had as yet filched under protest; it was to be, in the words of Burke, "a war of plunder."

Growth of  
Commerce.

Thus the period saw the birth of modern England, the England of manufactures, of world-wide trade, of commercial legislation, of vast funded systems, of great joint stock companies.

Economic  
Theory.

It was, moreover, a seed-time of economic doctrine. Men began to look round them to see from what sources revenue could be drawn, and what were the conditions of national prosperity from which those sources flowed. They began critically to compare the fiscal arrangements of England with those of France, Holland, Spain. They realised that the power of raising loans made the old policy of hoarding treasure obsolete. They were feeling their way along several different lines to a policy of free trade. They became conscious of the primary need of statistics. They learned that the public good could only be reached by the harmony of private aims. When writers had reached this point, the mercantile theory was practically dead, the field was open for Adam Smith and the true doctrine of national wealth.



THE SOUTH SEA BUBBLE, FROM A PRINT BY WILLIAM HOGARTH.



**Walpole's  
Finance.**

At this critical juncture the helm of State fell into the hands of a man who with most of the robust vices had also many of the robust virtues of a self-trained, businesslike English squire of the time. Walpole, after all that has been said against him, remains one of our few great finance ministers. He is the first of a roll which closes with the names of Huskisson, Peel, and Gladstone. He had all the penetration, all the broad view, and all the resourcefulness of the born man of business. He saw in matters of taxation just where the shoe pinched. He saw what the commerce of the day needed to open out its vast future. He could make gold out of nothing, it was said. It was he who guided the country through the worst panic it has ever known, who set the public debts on a sound footing, who initiated fiscal reform, who reconciled warring classes by reconciling their interests, who secured the new dynasty by identifying it with national prosperity. All this was a great work. It is true he despised literature, he dreaded religious movements, he shunned foreign affairs; he was coarse, he was domineering, he was a corrupter of politics; but to call him "an unidea'd statesman" is to forget the great work which he did, and the still greater work which he would fain have done.

**The Fiscal  
System.**

The English fiscal system under the first Georges has an even better right than the English legal system of Cromwell's time to be described as an ungodly jumble. The revenue consisted of customs and excise, land-tax, window-tax, stamps. These all represented rival principles of taxation, and invited a ceaseless warfare between classes, the landed and the moneyed interests, the merchants and the retailers, traders and consumers. Between customs and excise there should have been a line of clear-cut principle; there was instead a mere chaos. The old subsidy, the new subsidy, the impost, the additional impost, the new duties, the special duties, each with its own fractional rate, some dating back to 1660, constituted a labyrinth to be threaded only by experts; and the experts had their price, like the patriots. The appropriation of these duties, each to pay off some separate debt, was no less complicated and lucrative. The Customs Acts might have been described as Acts for the suppression of colonial timber, furs, sugar, and fisheries; for the extinction of the English manufacture of hats, silks, and paper; for the extension of adulteration in the necessaries of life; for

the promotion of the honourable profession of smuggler; and for the general advancement of frauds, abuses, and riots among all ranks of his Majesty's subjects.

About one-fifth of the revenue came from the land-tax. But the land-tax was assessed with ridiculous unfairness, and was regarded by landowners as a flagrant violation of good faith. The window-tax was a failure, as regards the amount raised by it; but a notable success, were its object to condemn a growing population to insufficient air and light.

As to the expenditure, about one-half of it was swallowed up by annual charges of the debt. For the nation had just learned the dangerous luxury of borrowing, but had not learned how to apply sound principles to the loans and their repayment.

Finally, in the way of any reforms stood not only the populace with their invincible prejudices, but, worse still, the legion of economic false prophets. Nevertheless, a large measure of reform was effected. It has been truly said that Walpole found our tariff the worst in the world, and he left it the best. His great Excise Scheme of 1733 had its way prepared by a long series of judicious measures. Timber was one of the "enumerated articles" of colonial produce secured to us by the Navigation Acts; but heavy duties checked its importation from the colonies. These duties Walpole repealed. He laid down the maxim, obvious but hitherto neglected, that the more prosperous the colonies were the greater would be their demand for English goods. In this spirit he allowed, in 1730, Carolina and Georgia to export their rice into Europe by English ships; and they soon won supremacy in the European markets. The same concession was granted in 1740 to the West Indies for their sugar, and to the northern whale and seal fisheries. The rapid growth of the colonies under such a liberal policy was afterwards demonstrated by Burke. French refugees had established successfully silk manufactures in Spitalfields; but they were hampered by heavy duties on the importation of raw silk, till Walpole countervailed these by allowing a drawback on the export of manufactured silk. Pepper, now becoming an article of common use, was still taxed at 2s. 6d. a pound, and that in seven separate sums payable under as many separate Acts. He reduced it to 4d. a pound, and dealt similarly with cloves and

Walpole's  
Reforms.

other spices. It was noticed what a stop this put to adulteration and to smuggling, both of which revived in all their vigour when Pitt raised the tax again to 2s. Similar reductions were made for indigo, drugs, beaver skins, and all materials used for paper. When the salt-tax was repealed, even hostile critics admitted the boon thus conferred on all the poor, and the expansion consequent in the glass and leather manufactures and in the fisheries. The general rule in these and kindred reforms may be summed up as a policy of relieving the burdens on food and the necessities of life, removing those on English manufactured goods, and encouraging the import of raw materials used in these manufactures. By 1721 he had thus set free 106 articles of export and 38 of import. But for the fact that Pitt and the Great War came between Sir Robert Walpole and Sir Robert Peel, there would have been little for the latter to do. Another timely reform was abolishing the valuation of imports by sworn evidence taken from the merchant, for custom-house oaths had become a proverb. These, like the other articles, were now included in official books of rates. In many other ways the whole system was simplified and made uniform.

**The Excise  
Bill.**

Walpole's Excise becomes still more important when it is thus seen in its proper light, as the sum and culmination of a whole fiscal policy. It is too often regarded as a mere sop to a political Cerberus, the Jacobite High-Church landowning class. It was, indeed, to have been the means of lowering the land-tax on that class. But for lowering the land-tax there was plenty of independent justification.

**The Land  
Tax.**

From 1717 to 1721 the land-tax stood at 3s. in the £; in 1722 it was lowered to 2s.; with the war scare in 1727 it shot up to 4s., and still stood at 3s. in 1728 and 1729; but in 1730 the rate was 2s., and in 1731 only 1s. To enable him to continue it at this rate, he even retraced the step taken in 1730, and in 1732 re-imposed a duty on salt.

The land-tax had been severely criticised from its very institution. Davenant had estimated that "usurers, lawyers, tradesmen, and retailers" held two-thirds of the wealth of the country; land and foreign trade represented the remaining one-third, but bore nearly all the taxation. "The landed men complained that ever since the Revolution they had borne the burden and heat of the day." The tax, it was said, pressed

hard on all gentry under £1,000 a year; Walpole himself declared, "it has ruined and undone many." What was keenly felt as a grievance was that, having been originally imposed as a land and property tax, it had very soon lost all pretence of reaching personal property; fundholders and merchants, professional men and shopkeepers escaped, as well as yeomen and small farmers, artisans and labourers. This was simply because it proved as impossible to make the assessment a reality as it had proved in the days of the Tudor and Stuart subsidy. The assessors at first received instructions, almost pathetic in their urgency, to make true and actual valuation on incomes and goods, as well as land, without following ancient rating-books. But, in fact, the assessment of 1692 became stereotyped as the model, and in 1697 this practice was accepted; the incomes and goods were somehow heard of no more. It was no use putting the assessors on oath; "for in matters of revenue it has always been found that oaths were very little regarded." So the tax came to mean an exact sum of £494,671, so much and no more, for every shilling levied per pound; while it was paid from land, and land alone. This was not the sole grievance. For when relative wealth as between town and country, and between shires and parishes, came to vary, the land-tax became more and more capriciously unequal; it was "as impolitic and unreasonable a method of raising great sums of money as was ever introduced in any nation" (Halifax). Hence already Davenant had written to urge that the excise should be increased instead, and that by levying it on bulky articles the need should be avoided of searching private houses. Walpole therefore was aiming at a genuine reform when he proposed to keep the land-tax at 1s., and meet the deficit by turning customs duties into duties of excise. His plan would, he estimated, effect at once a saving of £350,000 a year, would check adulteration, and be a deathblow to smuggling, and would increase the annual Civil List by £60,000. The method had been applied to silks as early as 1700, then extended to pepper, and to tea and coffee in 1723, all with marked success. It was simply the modern method of bonded warehouses. His first Bill was to apply to tobacco, on which Sir John Cope's Committee had lately reported to the House. The report had made a startling revelation of the fraud, corruption, perjury, and intimidation

Walpole's  
Plan of  
Reform.

Tobacco.

that were rampant. The trade had become a happy hunting-ground of commercial roguery. Imported tobacco was found to be underweighed by 20 per cent.; exported tobacco overweighed by as much. The officials were in the pay of the merchants, and kept double sets of weights and double sets of papers. It was a common form of agreement that the official should receive one-third of all the duty which he succeeded in filching from the State and in saving the trader. Drawbacks were being paid on "offal" got up to look like tobacco, on hogsheds weighted with bars of lead. One man had thus gained £550 in one shipment. In the last nine years there had been 2,000 prosecutions for these malpractices, and 209 boats had been seized; 250 officers had been violently assaulted, and 6 murdered. False witnesses were kept in readiness, ten or twelve at a time, to swear to whatever was wanted of them, and water-side ruffians in armed gangs of fifty at a time to do the rougher work. It had become as intolerable a tyranny over the colonial planter as it was a monstrous fraud upon the revenue. The whole system of discounts, allowances, and drawbacks fostered a mass of time-honoured abuses and extortions. All these evils would be swept away by the simple expedient of imposing only a small customs duty,  $\frac{3}{4}$ d. a pound, upon the tobacco as imported; and exacting the full tax ( $4\frac{3}{4}$ d.) as an excise duty only when the tobacco was actually sold to the retailer and delivered out of the warehouse. Simple, excellent, even obvious, as the measure was, it had two fatal defects. It bore the name of an Excise Bill, whereas the previous reforms discreetly called themselves only Customs Acts, and it was introduced by a minister who was surrounded by a pack of hungry rivals and of intriguing colleagues. The excise was loathed as a foreign mode of taxation. It was ineffaceably stamped with hateful memories of the Commonwealth time, and the tyrannical burdens then imposed upon the very necessities of life. It was supposed to mean summary powers of jurisdiction, inspection, and search over every Englishman's house. Even the landowners rejected it. Their enemy should find it was vain to spread his net in their sight. Locke had lately proved to their satisfaction that all duties on home products must fall ultimately on the land. They thought, if the land-tax was repealed, it would only be revived in a

Agitation  
against  
the Excise  
Bill.

stricter form on the first occasion of need. The traders thought the intention was to replace all customs duties by a general excise, which would somehow bring to an end their immunity from taxation. The common people foresaw an army of officials ranging the country, every citizen at the mercy of an informer, the labourer driven to live on roots, and the Englishman reduced to French slavery and sabots. "No slavery, no excise, no wooden shoes," was the current shibboleth. The soldiers were told their tobacco would rise to a prohibitive price; the colonels



EXCISE AND SERVITUDE, 1733.

(From a contemporary satirical print.)

reported that the regiments were ripe for mutiny. Even the corporation of London was, or pretended to be, as frantic as the mob, and attempted to intimidate Parliament. Pamphlets and petitions poured forth against "that monster the excise." In vain Walpole pointed out in the House that under the present system both the planters and the honest traders were half ruined; that while the gross tax on tobacco was £754,000, its net produce was only £161,000: that one-third of the tobacco imported was known to escape the duty. In vain he reasoned that there was already an excise to the amount of over

£3,000,000 a year working quite smoothly: that the dreaded army of officials would amount to 126, all told; that the right of search was to be more limited than that already exercised under the customs laws; that his plan would make London practically a free port and the central market of the world. When he offered reduction of the Debt or repeal of the taxes on soap and candles, Wyndham answered that he would prefer to this excise a land-tax of 10s. in the £, for liberty would then be secured and taxation no heavier. When he referred to Cope's report, Wyndham asked, Should we sacrifice the constitution to the prevention of frauds in the revenue? That Pulteney should denounce the whole thing as a mere scheme to entangle the inland boroughs in that network of Crown influence which the customs already spread over the seaports was natural enough. But it is hard to believe in the sincerity of Sir John Barnard, a leader in the business world, when he urged that only warehousing without an excise would content the merchants; that the existing excises were not a success; that Walpole had misstated the number of new officials required; and that, if he had his way, London would be not the most free port in the world but the most troublesome. All Walpole's enemies seized the opportunity, and swelled the outcry of irrational invective. His majority went down from 61 to 17. True, this was on a side issue. He could still have passed his measure. But it is doubtful if it could have been carried into execution—certainly not without bloodshed; "and I will not be the minister," he said to his supporters, "to enforce taxes at the expense of blood," adding, in a tone more congenial to his natural humour, "this dance will no further go." He bowed to the storm, and announced that for prudential reasons he seceded from that which he thought as right as ever.

The Bill  
Dropped.

It was a strange object-lesson as to the value of catchwords in politics. Had it but been called, as Lord Chesterfield in after years cynically remarked, an Act for the better securing the liberty and property of his Majesty's subjects by repealing some of the most burdensome custom-house laws, it would have been welcomed by all classes. As things were, its withdrawal was received with a roar of triumph from the whole nation. Men wore cockades marked "Liberty, Property, and no Excise." Bonfires blazed in the London streets. At Oxford for three



THE DEFEAT OF THE EXCISE BILL, FROM A PRINT OF 1754.



nights the gown treated the town to strong drinks and irrelevant huzzas for "James the Third." A generation later, in the sturdy prejudices of Dr. Johnson, excise was still "a hateful tax levied upon commodities, and adjudged by wretches hired by those to whom excise is paid."

It has been said that after such a defeat a minister should have resigned. But constitutional morality in that day did not profess to be scrupulous. Instead of resigning, he inflicted a sharp and merited punishment on a group of noble lords who had long been caballing against him, though ostensibly his supporters and some of them even his colleagues. It was well for the prosperity of England to have nine years more of peace and sound finance under his rule; but for all that, his position was seriously shaken, and in the new Parliament of 1735 his majority was much diminished.

The  
National  
Debt.

In 1714 the Debt stood at £52,000,000, and the annual charge upon it was nearly £3,500,000. A large part of the Debt was also unfunded. Swift said this burden was ruinous. Bolingbroke denounced it as incredible to future generations, and almost so to the present. Stanhope, with greater prescience, said it would grow much more, and need cause us no uneasiness. But many were alarmed. Moreover, at a time when the statutory rate of interest had been fixed at 5 per cent., when Holland could borrow at 4 per cent., and when, as a member said in the House of Commons, large advances could be got in ordinary business at 4 per cent., it began to be felt as absurd that 6, 7, or even 8 per cent. should still be paid as interest to fundholders. In 1710 Defoe wrote his excellent tract "On Loans," in which he sketched the creation of the Funds, which at first had to be encouraged by high interest, by premiums, and by lotteries. These led to speculation. From this, and from the dealing in securities issued for old arrears of taxes, and from the want of cash at the time of the recoinage, had arisen "the art and mystery of stockjobbing, when the whole City seemed turned into a corporation of usury." He was writing on Harley's behalf to combat the idea that this new "moneyed interest" was so Whig in its politics that a Tory administration would find itself unable to continue borrowing. High interest and good credit, he soundly remarks, will bring in loans despite all the parties and conspiracies in the world; the people can now no more do



THE LOTTERY, BY WILLIAM HOGARTH.

without the funds than the funds can do without them; no party can stop loans any more than they could stop the tide at London Bridge. He points out that when credit improved and Parliament was seen resolute to uphold it,

"you took off your premiums; you drew no more lotteries for sixteen years; you lowered your interest, you brought your annuities from 14 to 7 per cent., your interest on tallies from 7 to 6 per cent.; . . . had you brought the general interest of loans to 4 per cent., they must have come down."


The  
South Sea  
Company.

These were trenchant facts; and it was thus that Harley was enabled to form the South Sea Company in 1711, and so to provide for the floating debt of £10,000,000, funding it and securing the interest on wine and tobacco and other duties; the new Company, in return for their £10,000,000, being promised the monopoly of trade with Spanish South America, and of the privileges to be granted in the Treaty of Utrecht. It was declared a scheme worthy of Sully or Colbert. It was to be the Tory counterpart to Montague's Bank of England and East India Company. But the new shares only stood as yet at 77; and the Treaty only allowed a limited trade in negroes, a few factories, and the despatch of one annual ship to the Spanish colonies. As the first ship was not despatched till 1717, and war with Spain broke out again in 1718, the Company cannot ever have been on a sound basis. Walpole, however, in 1717, had framed a plan for the Bank to lend £2,500,000, and the Company £2,000,000, at interest reduced from 6 to 5 per cent., to buy up the short annuities which had still twenty-three years to run, and to pay off some of the redeemable Debt. He had resigned office the very day the plan was presented; but it was carried out by Stanhope. Two years later the Company offered to buy up £800,000 a year more of irredeemable annuities. It is remarkable that within six days two-thirds of the annuity-holders had accepted the terms, and South Sea stock had gone up to 123½. The Bank was more cautious than its rival, and was accused of being backward to reduce the public debts. Aislabie openly said, "The moneyed men want a check, and to be made to know that the landed men are masters of the main spring and stock of the wealth and strength of the kingdom." Law's schemes, now "at their meridian of success in December, 1719" (Anderson), had spread a sort of infection; there was no

1742]

proper organ of financial criticism at the time; and in a few weeks the Company had offered to take up £31,000,000 more of annuities. When the Bank made a rival offer, the South Sea directors outbid them by offering to pay £7,500,000 to the Exchequer before the close of 1720. Walpole spoke for the Bank, but the other offer was accepted. Its very magnitude spread the idea that the South Sea Company had some talismanic secret. Its stock had now risen to 400. There were rumours that Gibraltar would be exchanged for some ports in Peru. It was known that several leading ministers were

The  
South Sea  
Bubble.



THE BANK OF ENGLAND, BUILT IN 1733.

hand-in-glove with the directors. For the next six months England became a stockjobbing Bedlam. The Company actually increased its obligations, and with every increase the frenzy of investors grew more eager. On 12th April, £2,000,000 more was subscribed at 300; on the 23rd a fresh issue of £1,500,000 was made at 400. The directors declared a midsummer dividend of 10 per cent. On the 2nd June the stock was 890 in the morning, 640 in the afternoon, 750 in the evening. In July a new issue of £4,000,000 sold at 1,000. The top price, 1,060, had been reached on 25th June. The great fraud produced a host of lesser frauds. Over one hundred schemes, "bubbles or mere cheats," were floated; "a company for a wheel for perpetual

The  
Collapse.

motion, £1,000,000": "a company for carrying on an undertaking of great advantage, but nobody to know what it is" (this ingenious promoter got one thousand subscriptions by midday, and decamped with them that afternoon<sup>1</sup>); "for erecting hospitals for bastard children, £2,000,000"; "for transmutation of quicksilver into a fine metal," and so on. It is often said that the action of the South Sea directors in July, in getting these companies declared illegal, caused the collapse of their own bubble. But the general infatuation was proof against that shock, and on 31st August the market price was still 810. In September it fell rapidly; by the 9th it was 550; by the 21st, 150. "Their fast friends now drew off, including the Tories, Jacobites, and Papists, for these they have all along hugged; . . . the goldsmiths are daily going off, not a quarter of them will stand" (says a contemporary letter of Thomas Brodrick). There was one man, and one only, who could alleviate, if not stay, the disaster. All parties cast their eyes on Walpole. He had himself sold out at £1,000; but he had opposed the whole project he had proved a true prophet. Now he had to meet the panic without overloading State credit; to hold a strict inquiry into ministers' conduct without ruining the Whig party; to make signal examples of the guilty directors, but not mere victims. A peer had suggested they should be treated as parricides were in Rome. Petitions clamoured for vengeance on the cannibals of Change Alley who would have licked the last drops of the nation's blood. Eventually, thanks to Walpole, the directors got off with fines varying from the whole to a small fraction of their respective property; the total levied from them was £2,000,000. The fates of the ministers are well known; the deaths of Stanhope and Craggs, the suicide of Craggs the elder, the resignation of Sunderland, the severe punishment of Aislable and others. Aislable alone—who had put himself and friends down for £797,000 and then burnt his accounts—Walpole dared not defend. Finally, after several abortive schemes to get the Bank to take up part of the Company's stock, it was settled that the £7,000,000 which the Company stood pledged to pay over to Government should be remitted, and every shareholder receive £33 6s. 8d. on £100 stock.

<sup>1</sup> His proposal, however, only anticipated one of the operations of the modern "outside broker"—a "blind pool" in an unspecified stock.

Once more the extinction of the Debt had to be left to the humdrum methods of frugality and good management. The belief in hey-presto finance and in royal roads to national solvency should have now had its quietus. But in fact it held on to a last refuge, "the sacred sinking fund." This was at first a genuine surplus, the saving of £322,234, effected chiefly by the reduction of interest from 6 to 5 per cent. on a part of the Debt in 1717, and it was consecrated primarily to paying off debt

The  
Sinking  
Fund.



SCREENING THE SOUTH SEA DIRECTORS.

(From a satirical print of 1710)

incurred before 1716. Further steps brought the sinking fund to £1,200,000 a year by 1728. But it came in the popular imagination to be a sort of magical and costless device for the automatic extinction of debt by the operation of compound interest. To the embarrassed statesman it was an irresistible temptation, a well-spring of supply in an emergency; and when can a financier not plead emergency? If only the sinking fund were kept up fresh debt could be created without popular alarm. Thus in both ways it acted as an anodyne to the national conscience. Now and then this conscience half awoke and

stirred uneasily; as in 1728, when the discovery was made that only £2,500,000 had been paid off since 1716, there was an agitation by the Press, a great debate in the House; but finally a protest by the Whig Commons that all was well, and the nation might sleep again. Again in 1732, the fund was deprived of the Salt Tax, charged with the extra Civil List, and shorn of £500,000, to enable the land-tax to be lowered to 1s. In vain Barnard exclaimed that the author of such an expedient must expect the curses of posterity; and Pulteney mockingly proposed for Walpole the title of "Father," not of the sinking fund, but "Father of the Standing Army and the Excise." In 1733 Carteret attributed "the daily decay of our trade" to the spoliation of this "sacred fund"; the current service of the year ought to be met in the year, was his principle—a principle to which present-day politicians do not yet adhere, save when in opposition. Wyndham had asked what right there was to suppose future times would be more prosperous; but it was too convenient a supposition not to be acted on. At the close of Walpole's long term of power the Debt was, for all those years of peace and prosperity, much the same as it had been at the close of Marlborough's great wars. If this is to be condoned it must be by remembering Walpole's position. He had to conciliate the landowners to the new dynasty; he had to retain the loyalty of the fundholders, two-thirds of whom, it was found in 1737, held under £1,000 each. He had to be ready for war with Spain. He had, above all, to preserve spotless and beyond suspicion "that fair virgin, Public Credit." In the well-known essay in the *Spectator*, the Pretender is seen with a sword in one hand, a sponge in the other; and no investor doubted which of the two was the more formidable weapon. Even when Barnard proposed in 1737 that reducing of interest to 3 per cent. and paying off the annuitants which Pelham carried out soon after, it seemed a sufficient answer to point out that they did not wish it. It was argued further that it would be an injustice to the holders, who might in 1720 have claimed the whole amount of their bonds, "in which case the whole must have fallen on the landed interest." The proposal was defeated—one more illustration of the way in which public economy had to run on party and class lines, under an insecure dynasty. Walpole's good measures go to the credit of the financier; his bad must

be set down to the peculiar difficulties surrounding the politician.

The population of England and Wales was only 5,000,000 just before the Revolution; it was still hardly over 6,000,000 by 1742. The rate of increase was not to become rapid till after 1760. The relative numbers and earnings of each class remained, with one exception, much as they had been when Gregory King made his computations. That exception was the rise of certain towns—Sheffield, Birmingham, Manchester, Liverpool, Newcastle, Bristol, etc.—the districts, in fact, of the hardware and pottery, the cotton and woollen industries, and of the coalfields. In these and other towns the rise is very remarkable. Birmingham, for instance, increased sevenfold between 1685 and 1725. Men already began to say of England then, what in fact was not fully true till 1881, that half the people lived in towns. The changing balance of population was thus undoing the long supremacy of the Southern counties over the Northern. For though industrial history has not yet reached the epoch of the



LIVERPOOL IN 1725, BY S. AND N. BUCK.




The Social  
Economy.

great inventions or of the factory system, yet there were even now causes at work which favoured industrial progress. These causes were the general advance in English commercial activity, the introduction of new processes and methods of manufacture from abroad (IV., pp. 616, 794 *seq.*), and the growing tendency to abandon the old fettering system of restriction and regulation. As to the first of these facts, there is abundant evidence in the augmenting volume of East Indian and West American and North American trade, in the marked rise of the customs receipts, and in the success of the Navigation Acts. The third cause, the most important of all, displayed itself in several ways. The assessments of wages by Justices in Quarter Sessions died out in this period; the statutes of apprenticeship became a dead letter, and the restrictive powers of town corporations were seen to be obsolete and a mere nuisance. The places where industry flourished were those which would have none of these things. The great fact was disclosing itself, that in a vigorous and populous community competition could be trusted to work better than State regulation. Medieval systems like the assize of bread, of beer and of cloth, or the guilds, presupposed a country in which accumulation of capital was in its infancy and internal communications were very imperfect. But in the England of the eighteenth century the capitalist corn-dealer had made his appearance; and though canals may be said to date from the Bridgwater Canal to Manchester (1761: p. 435), yet Defoe's tour shows long before that date the great use made of river carriage, and the value of the turnpike roads established in the Midlands and extended by the general Highways Act of 1741. These roads at once lowered the cost of carriage by 1s. a cwt., and would (he prophesies) increase the consumption of fish a hundredfold.

Rural  
Life.

Among other favourable influences was the relative cheapness of wheat, due chiefly to a long run of good seasons. Wheaten bread was but slowly superseding among the labourers the use of rye, barley, and oatmeal. The spread of enclosures, though to contemporaries they seemed by no means an unmixed good, must at least have added immensely to the productive powers of the land. It is true that the area thus enclosed in the first sixty years of the century was a small amount (3,000,000 acres) compared with what was done in the next period. It is

noticeable, too, that Eden's figures show that agricultural rents were almost stationary between 1689 and 1795. The prosperity of the rural classes depended more, it is clear, on the prevalence of by-industries, which were so marked a feature of the Eastern counties, and of Devon, Somerset, Gloucester, Worcester, and the West Riding. There, "a child of four or five years old could earn its own bread." Thus, of the five main processes required in the manufacture of cloth, three (the spinning of the yarn, the weaving of the cloth, the dressing of the cloth) were performed by cottagers and their families working at home. In agricultural



QUAY ON THE IRWELL AT MANCHESTER.

(From a view of about 1740.)

wages proper there was little improvement: there was a rise of 20 per cent., according to Professor Thorold Rogers; but it is curious to find the statement, in the original seventeenth-century edition of Chamberlayne's "Britanniæ Notitia," that English day labourers are better off in dwellings, diet, and apparel, than farmers in other countries, followed in the edition of 1755 by this significant correction: "Their wages being but 8d. or 10d. a day . . . those who have large families find it very difficult frequently to find them bread."

The best general view of the country about this time is to be found in Defoe's *Tour*, 1724-5.<sup>1</sup> It leaves a strong general impression of the wealth and ease that had come in since the

England  
in 1725.

<sup>1</sup> The republication of 1742, which claims to be more accurate and condensed, succeeds at least in being more dull and uninteresting.

Revolution. Many districts we see prosperous by cottage industries; Norfolk and Essex, Devon, Somerset, Wilts, Dorset, Gloucester, Leicestershire, and the West Riding. Kent was decaying; but some 1,500 "graycoats" who were yeomen still came in at election times in the Maidstone district. The North seems still like a different country, "wild, barren, and frightful," except in the scattered industrial centres. He is always ready to point out how the whole country contributes to the sustenance of London; even from the far North great droves of cattle are sent to be fattened in the Eastern counties marshes for the London markets. In the South the one main industry, from Thames mouth to Land's End, he declares to be smuggling. In Bristol he traces the crippling effects of a Corporation. He notes the chief homes of dissent: Bristol, Bridgwater, Taunton, Devonshire, Reading, Newcastle. He gives a vivid description of the great fairs, Stourbridge, Penkridge, Horn Fair, and the Mop Fairs. He denounces the scenes at the race meetings, Newmarket and elsewhere; but is full of compliments on the polite society of many of the country towns whose annual winter or summer "seasons" had not been absorbed into that of the capital.

**The Poor  
Law.**

Defoe's Tour gives the bright side of things: it is touched with the smug optimism characteristic of British prosperity. The dark side must be studied in the Poor Law history. The history tells us indeed that the cost of poor relief had fallen from £819,000 in 1698 to £689,000 in 1750. But this was bought at a price that was to come heavy on posterity; for it was effected by a ruthless and vigilant exercise of the Settlement Law of 1662. The economic effects of the law are the subject of a well-known chapter in Adam Smith. Its actual working is best described by a contemporary Justice (Burn):—

"The office of an overseer seems to be understood to be this: . . . to prevent persons coming to inhabit without certificates; . . . if a man brings a certificate, to caution all the inhabitants not to let him a farm of £10 a year; . . . to warn them, if they will hire servants, to hire them half-yearly; . . . to maintain their poor as cheap as they possibly can; . . . to bargain with some sturdy person to take them by the lump, who yet is not intended to take them but to hang over them *in terrorem*; . . . to bind out poor children apprentices, no matter to whom or to what trade, but to take special care that the master live in another parish; . . . to pull down cottages . . . to depopulate the parish."



RACING AT NEWMARKET ABOUT 1790, AFTER TILLEMANS.

This passage enables us to understand the "open war against cottages as nests of beggars' brats" (Arthur Young), the "division of the whole country into belligerent districts," and "the worst grievance of the poor, the impossibility of getting habitations" (Eden). In some few places, no doubt, these laws must have been practically suspended, or else the growth of the great towns would be inexplicable. But what could be the general effect of a harsh law entrusted to the hands of some 20,000 annually appointed unpaid overseers? It might well be true, as Adam Smith declared, that no poor man could reach forty years without suffering grievous oppression under this law at some time or other. The legislature acknowledged there were abuses when, under George II., it passed Acts to force overseers to render yearly accounts, to prevent their giving orders for relief in kind to be paid at specified shops, to control their lists of permanent cases, and to make them more liberal with the "certificates," without which a labourer could not leave his parish. With the same feeling of checking overseers' tyranny it had become common for justices to order relief without reference to the overseers: and the Act of George I. only modified this power by delaying the action of a justice till, relief having been refused by overseers, he had summoned them to show cause. The arbitrary powers thus committed to irresponsible and ill-qualified officials were destined before the close of the century to manifest their disastrous results to the full.

**Work-  
houses.**

Besides this interference by the justices, and the continuance of Settlement Laws, there was one more fact of capital importance in the Poor Law history of the period. This was the Act of 1722, providing for the erection of workhouses and the offering of relief in the workhouses, and only in them. Here we have the "workhouse test," which has been since 1834 more and more clearly recognised as the cardinal principle of sound administration. It is strange, therefore, that a recent German work should state that between 1601 and 1760 the legislature made no changes of principle in the Poor Law system. The fact is, that the "Account of Several Workhouses," published in 1725 and again in 1732, shows that about sixty were in working, and with remarkable results. Lord Mansfield, in 1782, said they had cut down the poor rate by one-half; and the returns are still extant which prove that annual expenses went down from £566 to £275

1742]

at St. Albans, from £945 to £574 at Chatham, from £170 to £100 at Harborough, and so on. Not merely could a man be kept for 17d. or 18d. a week who had cost twice as much out of the workhouse, and "great numbers of lazy people, rather than submit to the workhouse, are content to throw off the mask and maintain themselves." Unfortunately the very term "workhouse" fluctuated in meaning between the three senses of asylum, house of correction, public workshop. The new workhouses, too, often drifted into the practical fallacy of "finding work" for the unemployed, a fallacy as rife then as now: though Defoe, in his admirable pamphlet, "Giving Alms no Charity," had pierced it through and through. The true value and use of workhouses was better seen by Hay, whose Bill, 1736, proposed to make them general, to apply them as a test, to group parishes into unions, to control the overseers by guardians appointed from the gentry. But the cry was raised that this meant a general poor rate, a cry nearly as potent as that against a general excise. So wide a social reform ran counter to Walpole's maxim, "*Quieta non movere*," and the Bill was rejected. The original institution of workhouses had been as houses of correction, and this purpose they still continued to serve. The existing laws against vagrants were summed up in a drastic Statute of 1753, which included fencers, bearwards, players, minstrels, jugglers, gipsies. The plan was to set them to a task; for it had been discovered that "work was worse than death to them."

The Poor Law system had then some merits and many defects; its merits were that the impotent and aged poor were humanely treated. The Act of 1722 and the Affiliation Act of 1732 were important and salutary. The poor rate was steadily declining in amount; there were not a few writers and practical men who took a just view of the facts. On the other hand, its defects were many: conflict of jurisdiction, neglect of the law ordering registers and accounts, want of uniformity and incorporation, inefficiency of the overseers, prevalence of "party-jobs and private views," and certain signs of a sentimental wave ominous for the future.

Besides the Poor Law, the savage and stupid penal code of the time, the impudent openness of robbery and violence, the revolting callousness and intrigue of society, the admixture of

the brutal and the mawkish that is so striking in the literature—all these make it difficult to read with fairness the periodicals of the "pudding times" of the two Georges. It is quite what might be expected that the English who, since the Restoration,



GIN LANE, BY WILLIAM HOGARTH, 1751.

**Drunken-  
ness.**

had been displacing Danes and Dutch in reputation as toppers, now fell into the worst of all drunken habits—the habit of gin drinking. Till 1723 this vice remained a privilege of the rich, for brandy and rum were dear; brandy, as an import from

France, being heavily taxed, and rum being a protected colonial product. But now the distillers began to produce whisky and gin. It was urged in Parliamentary debate that the decline in beer and ale would injure the agricultural interest; the decline in rum would ruin our West Indian colonies. Vested interests, the cause of the poor, the liberty of Britons, the morality of moderate drinking, the unwholesomeness of "Parliament brandy," the perquisites of the Civil List, were the considerations invoked on the other side, against Jekyll's Gin Act. This Act tried to stamp out the evil by a duty of 20s. a gallon, and by charging £50 for a licence. Its chief results were riots and clandestine sale. The consumption of British spirits had been in 1727 three and a half million of gallons, and in 1735 nearly five and a half; by 1742 it was 7,162,000. But the retailers continued to offer men to be "drunk for 1d., dead drunk for 2d., and straw for nothing." The increase of robbers, the growth of pauperism, the appearance of new diseases, were all ascribed to gin. In 1743 the duty was abruptly dropped to 1d. a gallon; by 1751, when the maximum was reached, the consumption was 11,000,000 gallons, the number of gin shops "within the Bills of Mortality" (a significant conjunction) was said to be 17,000; and London and the great towns long continued to be "more like a scene of a Bacchanal than the residence of a civil society."

DURING the twenty-eight years of Walpole's administration no fundamental change took place in the characteristics of English social life. Throughout the ranks of society a certain inertness and passivity, a careless submission to existing conditions, may be noted; all but a few sharp-tongued malcontents like Swift, Lady Mary Montague, Lord Hervey, and Sir Horace Walpole accepted those pleasures which the world had to offer and were not dissatisfied. The absence of any signs of intellectual or moral progress caused no distress. The signs of the times were noted, but their tendency was not resisted; they were accepted as unalterable facts, and to acknowledge sagaciously the facts of human nature without idealisation was esteemed true wisdom. Society was aware of the existence of critics, who despised human nature and took pleasure in carping, but the verdict of

MARY  
BATESON  
Social  
Life.



the critics did not carry weight. They were not united, and did not evince in their own conduct that zeal for reform which they urged upon others.

As yet the word "shocking" had not become common in the vocabulary of fashion;<sup>1</sup> and vivacious Court ladies like Miss<sup>2</sup> Bellenden, Miss Lepel, Miss Howe, and Miss Vane had no cause to fear that their *étourderie* would expose them to the charge of immodesty. Only towards the end of the period the signs of a change are seen—a change from boorish behaviour to the opposite extreme of stilted politeness, from the manners of Walpole to the manners of Chesterfield.

#### The Court.

George I., hating the parade of royalty and unable to express himself in English, gathered few English ladies and fewer English men about his Court. His evening parties were presided over by his mistresses, the Duchess of Kendal (Mme. Schultenberg) and the Countess of Darlington (Mme. Kilmansegg). His unfortunate taste for plain women made him a public laughing-stock, and both ladies were in every way ill-fitted to become leaders of society.

A more considerable influence than the court of George I. was the court of the Prince of Wales, who left St. James's Palace in 1717, after his quarrel with his father, for Leicester House, in the north-east corner of the square then called Leicester Fields. The Princess Caroline's strong personality won for her many friends, and the Prince's mistresses were sprightly and English. All the liveliest members of society came to their reunions twice a week, and their "drawing-room" every morning was largely attended. When the Prince of Wales succeeded to the throne, crowds came to see His Majesty dine in public, a sight that Anne and George I. had not permitted their subjects to enjoy.

Common-sense and good-nature were the virtues which George I., George II., and Queen Caroline esteemed highly, for they possessed them in uncommon measure, and they were virtues on which society at large then set an unusually high value. Only in one or two points did this royal group allow a certain margin for sentiment. In one respect at least their

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Fielding's "Covent Garden Journal," 1752.

<sup>2</sup> The word was now applied, together with Mrs., to unmarried women of good reputation.

delicacy found few imitators. Both George II. and his queen considered it indelicate to be ill, and would submit to tortures rather than confess to pain. Equally at variance with their usual strong sense, but more unfortunate as an example, was the "gallantry" of George I. and George II., which they believed to be essential to their position. The queen's doctrine, on the other hand, was that all "romance" or sentiment was contemptible, and she allowed herself to become the confidante of her husband's intrigues.<sup>1</sup>

The *brusquerie* of the queen's daily language was recognised as something exceptional by her contemporaries. The Duchess of Marlborough observed that, when Frederick Prince of Wales established his rival court at Norfolk House,

"the young Princess of Wales' conversation was more proper for a drawing-room than the wise Queen Caroline's was, who never was half an hour without saying something shocking to somebody or other, even when she intended to oblige, and generally very improper discourse for a public room."<sup>2</sup>

George II., his queen, and Walpole had a great command of

<sup>1</sup> Hervey, "Memoirs," ii. p. 168. Horace Walpole, "Reminiscences." Campbell's "Life of Lord Chancellor King."

<sup>2</sup> Extracts from letters of Sarah Duchess of Marlborough, in Cunningham's edition of "Walpole's Letters," I. cliii.



Photo: Walker & Cockerell.  
QUEEN CAROLINE, BY ENOCH SEEMAN.  
(National Portrait Gallery.)

rude language and simile. George's favourite exclamations were "Pooh!" "Stuff!" He called all his ministers rogues, scoundrels, rascals, dirty buffoons, impertinent fools, stinking choleric blockheads, and talkers of fiddle-faddle. But humour of such a gross description as that in which Charles II. indulged was now reserved for Sir Robert Walpole; and what was once not offensive in the manners of a king famed for good breeding stamped Walpole, whose manners were those of the country squire, as an ill-bred man.

**English  
Manners.**

Those who travelled abroad regretted the absence of refinement in English manners. In some circles, however, knowledge of the "usage of the world," graceful movements, and choice language received their due reward. There was a circle possessed of "the distinguishing diction that marks the man of fashion, a certain language of conversation that every gentleman should be master of." Chesterfield teaches that it is boorish to congratulate a friend on his approaching marriage with merely, "I wish you joy." What should be said is, "Believe me, my dear sir, I have scarce words to express the joy I feel upon your happy alliance with such or such a family." The "compliments of condolence" on a bereavement should be, not, "I am sorry for your loss," but, "I hope, sir, you will do me the justice to be persuaded that I am not insensible of your unhappiness, that I take part in your distress, and shall ever be affected when *you* are so."<sup>1</sup>

His child began his lessons in "breeding" at nine years old, having till then learnt Latin, Greek, French, history, and geography. He is warned to beware of using proverbial sayings in his speech, such as, "One man's meat is another man's poison," or, "Everyone as they like, as the good man said when he kissed his cow." He must attend to the graceful motion of his arms, the manner of putting on his hat and giving his hand.

Horace Walpole's entrance into a room is described by an eye-witness as

"in the style of affected delicacy which fashion had made almost natural, *chapeau bras* between his hands, as if he wished to compress it, or under his arm: knees bent, and feet on tiptoe, as if afraid of a wet floor."

<sup>1</sup> Stone, "Chronicles of Fashion," ii. p. 330.

The long wigs, with curls reaching almost to the waist, were no longer worn, and the ends of the wig were either plaited in a pig-tail or put in a black silk bag. The "pretty gentleman" wore a "toupee" of curls raised high over his forehead. For daily wear most gentlemen were dressed, like George I., in a dark tie-wig, plain coat, waistcoat and breeches of snuff-coloured cloth, and stockings of the same colour; for ceremony, like Horace Walpole, in a lavender suit, the waistcoat embroidered with a little silver or of white silk embroidered in the tambour-frame, partridge-silk stockings, gold buckles, ruffles, lace frill and powdered wig. Early in the period shoulder-knots were worn, and beads were fastened to the end of the cravat to correct the stubbornness of the muslin. The linen for shirts was bought in Holland, costing from ten to fourteen shillings the English ell<sup>1</sup> (45 inches).

**Men's  
Dress.**

During the first few years of George I.'s reign the poor country people and servants, and even the gentry, were wearing Indian chintzes and Dutch-printed calicoes. The riots of the wool and silk weavers in

1719, and the attacks made on women who ventured to wear these materials in the streets, led ultimately to legislation (p. 149); and in 1722 ladies were busy pulling their calico gowns to pieces to make them into quilts and furniture-covers, as they were forbidden to wear them. Instead they wore dimities, linens sprigged with flowers, fine holland worked by their own hands, at the risk of having these too torn from their backs by the enraged weavers.<sup>2</sup>

Queen Caroline had no taste in dress; at her coronation

**Women's  
Dress.**



*Photo: Walker & Cockerell.*  
HORATIO WALPOLE, FOURTH EARL OF  
ORFORD, BY JOHN ECCARDT.

(National Portrait Gallery.)

<sup>1</sup> 1734. Chesterfield writes to the Hague for four dozen Holland shirts.

<sup>2</sup> Lee's "Defoe," iii. 92, etc.


she wore finery which her friend, Lord Hervey, describes as a mixture of magnificence and meanness. Upon her person was bestowed £2,400,000 worth of jewels, all borrowed. Throughout the period hoops were worn, and the bulk of the skirt permitted very large patterns to be used in the brocades. A lady appeared at the Princess Royal's wedding in the fashionable "lutestring" (corded silk) at 13s. a yard, which, she says, was "brocaded with great ramping flowers in shades of purples, reds, and greens." The Duchess of Bedford's petticoat was green paduasoy, embroidered very richly with gold and silver and a few colours; the pattern was festoons or shells, corals, corn, cornflowers, and seaweeds. Another dress is described as "festoons of nothing at all," supported by pillars in brocade, and interspersed with flowerpots of flowers.

"The Duchess of Queensberry's clothes pleased me best; they were white satin embroidered, the bottom of the petticoat *brown hills*, covered with all sorts of weeds, and *every breadth* had *an old stump of a tree* that run up almost to the top of the petticoat, broken and ragged and worked with brown chenille, round which twined nastertians, ivy, honeysuckles, periwinkles, convolvuluses, and all sorts of twining flowers which spread and covered the petticoat, vines with the leaves variegated as you have seen them by the sun, all rather smaller than nature, which made them look very bright; the robings and facings were little green banks with all sorts of weeds, and the sleeves and the rest of the gown loose twining branches of the same sort as those on the petticoat; many of the leaves were finished with gold, and part of the stumps of the trees looked like the gilding of the sun. I never saw a piece of work so prettily fancied, and am quite angry with myself for not having the same thought, for it is infinitely handsomer than mine, and could not cost much more."

In a moment of gloom the writer of this description says, "I grow sick of the word 'fine' and all its appurtenances." The Duchess of Queensberry, however, was not always fine; she arrived on one occasion at a party "in a mob and white hood pinned close under her chin, yellow mohair gown, no ruffles, only little frills sewed to her shift, no hoop, a tumbled apron, and her capuchin (hood) dangling round her arm."

Masque-  
rades.

It was a period in which fancy-dress balls were popular and the pursuit of pleasure at the masquerade was unflagging. Anne had disapproved of masquerades, and would not allow Heidegger, the famous opera manager (p. 121), to introduce them. In 1716 Chesterfield writes to Dodington that "balls,



THE REVIEW: A SATIRE ON HOOPS.  
 (From a satirical print of about 1783.)

assemblies, and masquerades take the place of the dull formal visiting-days" of Anne's time. The masquerades were at first held at the King's Theatre in the Haymarket, and subscription-tickets were bought at White's Chocolate House. Every effort was made to confine the audience to the "quality" and to prevent drunkenness and disorder, but without success. The Grand Jury presented the King's Theatre in its list of nuisances, "conceiving the same to be an unlawful design to carry on gaming." In 1726 the Bishop of London preached against masquerades in Bow Church before the Society for the Reformation of Manners. A royal proclamation was issued against them, but as the king and prince attended them, and as Heidegger was made Master of the Revels, they continued in fashion, under the name of "Ridottos." In 1727 Mrs. Pendarves writes: "Masquerades are not to be forbid, but there is to be another entertainment bare-faced, which are balls" (*sic*). In 1729 the Grand Jury of Middlesex again presented masquerades as the principal promoters of vice and immorality.


**Ranelagh.**

In 1733 a villa belonging to Viscount Ranelagh in Chelsea, which was then a country district, was bought by a builder for £3,200. In 1742 the grounds had been laid out. Horace Walpole writes (May 26th, 1742):—

"Two nights ago Ranelagh Gardens were opened at Chelsea. The Prince, Princess, the Duke (of Cumberland), much notability and much mob besides were there. There is a vast amphitheatre, finely gilt, painted and illuminated, into which everybody that loves eating, drinking, staring, or crowding, is admitted for 1s. Building and laying out the gardens cost £16,000. Twice a week there are to be Ridottos at guinea tickets, for which you are to have supper and music. I was there last night, but did not find the joy of it. Vauxhall is a little better, for the garden is pleasanter and one goes by water."

Under Jonathan Tyer, Vauxhall had recovered its reputation, and it was reopened (1736), decorated with designs by Hogarth. The humbler citizens went for similar entertainments to Sadler's Wells, Islington, and Cupar's Gardens, Lambeth, opposite Somerset House. Marylebone Gardens were fashionable for breakfast parties, for bowling and for cold bathing in the open air.

National feeling, irrespective of religious sentiment, was hostile to the dramã. Only a small class frequented the



RANBLAGH IN 1762, AFTER CANALETTO.



## Theatres

theatres, for the world of fashion had withdrawn to the opera-house. To create counter-attractions the theatres started pantomimes and harlequinades, and the legitimate drama was banished until the close of the period, when Garrick began to act Shakespeare in the Goodman Fields Theatre. In 1728 the success of Gay's *Beggar's Opera* at Lincoln's Inn Fields gave a brief impulse to the drama as a political instrument: but the Court party was able to suppress as "licentious"<sup>1</sup> all plays which were



THE STAGE IN 1731.

(From a contemporary print.)

hostile to the Government. The *Beggar's Opera* ran fifty nights at Bristol, Bath, and other provincial towns, and by the thirty-sixth night in London, Gay had made £800, and Rich, the manager, £4,000. Lavinia Fenton, who made the part of Polly, received only thirty shillings a week, but was rewarded for her efforts by becoming the wife of the Duke of Bolton. In 1731 Covent Garden Theatre was built, but opera languished, and at

<sup>1</sup> Hervey, "Memoirs," iii. 142.

the close of the period the fashionable world was seeking oratorio for variety (p. 125). In 1734 an oratorio by Porpora was performed at Lincoln's Inn Fields; Mrs. Pendarves found it too solemn for a theatre, and preferred Handel's oratorios, *Esther* and *Deborah*. In 1741 elaborate scenery was tried at the opera-house, with improved dancing, and for a while "the town" ran after it. Horace Walpole says:

"They have flung open the stage to a great length, and made a perfect view of Venice, with the Rialto and numbers of gondolas that row about full of masks, who land and dance."

The love of card-playing, which had formerly been characteristic of aristocratic circles only, now infected all alike. The favourite games at court were "quadrille," an improvement on ombre, and "commerce." Both games depended on the stakes for their interest. Writing in 1733, Chesterfield says to Lady Suffolk:—

"Your Hampton Court recreations, I find, give the lie to those who complain of the uncertainty and instability of Courts, since the same joyous measures have for these sixteen revolving years been steadily pursued without interruption. Commerce must surely have played its cards excellently well, to have kept its ground so long or—the first courteous opener of this letter may insert the rest."<sup>1</sup>



A RAFFLE.  
(From a Playing Card.)

In the king's absence, Hervey writes that "the Queen at St. James's passed her common evenings just as she had done at Kensington"—that is, in her private apartments, playing quadrille with two ladies, whilst the Princess Caroline, a maid of honour, and Lord Hervey played pools at cribbage; and the duke, Princess Emily, and the rest of the chance-comers of the family played at basnet.

The gains and losses of the king and queen were, as a rule, restricted to hundreds; but on Twelfth Night it was customary

<sup>1</sup> The letters of the time are full of complaints of Post Office espionage.

for thousands of pounds to change hands. Lady Cowper, a lady in waiting, for the sake of her children refused to sit down to play, as none sat down to the table with less than £200.<sup>1</sup>

The ladies who gambled at the Belsize tables, Hampstead, and at Richmond, had great difficulty in reaching town with their gains, as they were systematically attacked on the road by highwaymen.<sup>2</sup>

At the end of the period a rage for whisk, or whist, set in, but at first it was considered too wise a game for ladies to join in. In 1742 Horace Walpole found it absolutely necessary to learn it, as he waited "in vain for its being left off."

Card-playing for the time being displaced reading and intelligent conversation, but it assisted in uniting the sexes. George II. hated books, and Caroline was only suffered to read her Rollin by stealth. The "philosophical virtuosi" no longer held the place in society which once had been theirs. Sometimes a duchess kept a literary man attached to her household, but in England no ladies attempted to lead a "salon," and foreigners like Angeloni noted the contempt which was shown in England for women's literary opinions. Few women but the queen showed any interest in politics.

Raffles  
and  
Lotteries

The absence of intellectual speculation was made up for by speculation at cards, in lotteries and raffles. Most female shopping was done on the raffling system. It is impossible to open a volume of the correspondence of the period without finding references to the writer's anxiety about the fate of lottery tickets<sup>3</sup> or South Sea shares (p. 168). In 1720 Smollett says:

"Exchange Alley was filled with a strange concourse of statesmen and clergymen, churchmen and dissenters, Whigs and Tories, physicians and lawyers, tradesmen, and even females; all other professions and employments were utterly neglected."


The streets were full of the South Sea equipages of the newly enriched; three thousand gold watches were at women's sides, bought by South Sea fortunes. Defoe writes, "Don't you know a South Sea face?" There were two kinds—one as stock rose, another as it fell. After the fatal 24th of June, he writes:—

<sup>1</sup> "Diary," p. 14; Doran, "London in Jacobite Times," ii. 27. Letter-Books of John Hervey, first Earl of Bristol (1894), iii. 29, etc.

<sup>2</sup> Lee's "Defoe," ii. 59.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Lady Mary Wortley Montague, ii. 5.

"You may now at a tavern have a mutton cutlet broil'd by Blousabella, the kitchen damsel, without being teas'd with her enquiries of what new subscriptions are come out that day. You may go to the coffee house and call for a dish of tea or coffee and have it without difficulty, whereas if you said, 'Jack, give me a dish of Bohea,' he would presently say—without taking notice of what you call'd for—'Sir, will you buy a thousand pound stock in rock, in rock-salt, or the ground fishery.' and so on, thro' all the rest. If you come not to his price, the blue apron'd dog would cry, 'Sir, I'll give



RELICS OF HIGHWAYMEN.

(York Museum.)

you a thousand pound a share for as many as you will bring me,' and so in proportion for any bubble that was afoot."

The miseries caused by the losses in Change Alley were felt by all classes in town, and by the upper classes in the country; numbers committed suicide. Some joined the ranks of the foot-pads and highwaymen.

The self-love which good-natured persons of the upper classes professed as evidence of their "strong sense," the contempt of

Lawless-  
ness.

humanity which the cynics boasted as evidence of their keen observation, showed themselves in the humbler ranks of society in contempt of law and order. Thefts, shoplifting, foot-padding, street assaults, and highway robbery were daily incidents, and the newspapers were full of lists of "lost"—that is, stolen—property, and of accounts of the insecurity of the streets. Those who ventured to cry "Stop thief!" when their wigs were snatched from their heads were instantly shot dead, and no captures were made. Day after day, for weeks together, the Hampstead, Islington, and Hackney coaches were stopped in broad daylight and the passengers plundered. The mail between Bristol and London was robbed five times in as many weeks. The stage waggon between Notting Hill and Tyburn Gate was unloaded, a proceeding which took several daylight hours. Charing Cross, Holborn, Fleet Street, and St. Paul's Churchyard were the footpads' favourite haunts. In spite of the number of prisoners taken, the number of attacks did not diminish. Men were strung up on the gallows in tens and twenties, and many were shipped to the Plantations because on the weekly Tyburn hanging day there was not room upon the gallows. The capital penalty had little deterrent effect, for hanging was considered a heroic end, and the processions to the gibbet were triumphal.<sup>1</sup> As in the French Cartouchian movement, to which Defoe compares this outbreak of disorder (1720–30), whole classes banded themselves together to prey upon society.

The Owlers leagued with the justices and landed gentry to defraud the customs; the Blacks in the western counties were yeomen and well-to-do farmers organised for the purpose of burglary; the highwaymen were recruited from all ranks.<sup>2</sup> The death of the burglar Jack Sheppard on the gallows (1724), and the story of his marvellous escapes, inspired romantic youths to emulate him; and the story of Jonathan Wild, thief-taker and receiver of stolen goods, who was hanged in 1725, and of the highwayman Dick Turpin, hanged in 1739, increased the glory of those trades. Although the turnpikes were provided with speaking-trumpets which enabled them to put the neighbouring turnpikes on their guard, the impassableness of the by-ways prevented a systematic hue-and-cry. In 1728 Defoe wrote his "Method to prevent Street Robberies," and suggested that

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Malcolme, v. 30.

<sup>2</sup> Lee's "Defoe," i. 340, etc.

constables should be stout, able-bodied men, not aged and decrepit, and that the number of public lamps should be increased. But his suggestions were not put into effect.

The beginnings of a humanitarian movement seen in Anne's time (IV., p. 808) died away, and brutality was restored to its former reign. The great cavalcades of orphans with colours and streamers which had then paraded the streets no longer appeared. Defoe charges the Charitable Societies and the Societies for Reformation with talking much and doing little. They are "sunk and come to nothing." He asks, Why do not the societies, besides pursuing scandalous persons and putting down disorderly houses, prosecute for swearing, perjury, and unnecessary oaths? <sup>1</sup> The methods open to the Society, convictions resulting in carting, whipping, and fines, did not admit of much good work, and its influence had also been tainted with suspicion of political partisanship.

Failure of  
Philan-  
thropic  
Effort.

In London the severance of the West from the East End, begun in the reign of Charles II., became more and more complete with the spread of the city westward. Fielding, writing in 1752, <sup>2</sup> says:

Growth of  
London.

"Within the memory of many now living the circle of the people of fashion (fashion) included the whole parish of Covent Garden and the greater part of St. Giles-in-the-fields; but here the enemy (the common people) broke in, and the circle was presently contracted to Leicester Fields and Golden Square. Hence the people of fashion again retreated before the foe to Hanover Square, whence they were once more driven to Grosvenor Square and even beyond it, and that with such precipitation that had they not been stopped by the walls of Hyde Park, it is more than probable they would by this time have arrived in Kensington."

Macky, writing in 1722, says:

"I am lodged in the street called Pall Mall, the ordinary residence of all strangers. If you would know our manner of living it is thus:—We rise by nine, and those that frequent great men's levees find entertainment at them till eleven, or, as in Holland, go to tea-tables. About twelve the *beau monde* assembles in several coffee or chocolate houses, the best of which are the Cocoa Tree and White's Chocolate-houses, St. James's, the Smyrna, Mrs. Rochford's and the British Coffee-houses, and all these so near to one another that in less than an hour you see the company of them all. We are carried to these places in chairs, which are here very cheap, a guinea a week, or one shilling per hour, and your chair-men serve you for porters to run on

London  
Life.

<sup>1</sup> Lee's "Defoe," ii. 104.

<sup>2</sup> "Covent Garden Journal," 1752.

errands. . . . If it is fine weather we take a turn in the park till two, when we go to dinner, and if it be dirty, you are entertain'd at picquet or basset at White's, or you may talk politics at Smyrna, or St. James's. I must not forget to tell you that the parties have their different places, where, however, a stranger is always well received, but a Whig will no more go to the Cocoa Tree or Osinda's than a Tory will be seen at the coffee-houses of St. James's. The Scots generally go to the British, and a mixture of all sorts to the Smyrna.

"Ordinaries are not so common here as abroad, but there are good

French ones in Suffolk Street.

The general way here is to make a party at the coffee-house to go to dine at the tavern, where we sit till six, when we go to the play, except you are invited to the table of some great man. After the play the best company generally go to Tom's and Will's Coffee-houses near adjoining, where there is playing at picquet and the best of conversation till midnight. . . . Or if you like rather the company of ladies, there are assemblies at most people of quality's houses."



A COFFEE HOUSE.

(From a print of 1733)

Food and  
Drink

their prices owing to the taxes on coffee, tea, and newspapers, and charged for coffee 2d. per dish, green tea 1½d., and all drams 2d. per dram. Black tea was sold in 1710 from 12s. to 28s. a pound: green, 10s. to 16s.; Bohea and Pekoe were more costly. Smuggled and "sophisticated," or adulterated, tea was used by the poorer classes: for the tax on tea was 5s. a pound. Coffee in 1710 was at 5s. 8d.; chocolate, 3s. This was a year of average prices.<sup>1</sup> The Whigs would not touch French

Garraway's, Robin's, and Jonathan's coffee-houses near the Exchange, once fashionable resorts, were now frequented only by business men.

At the end of Anne's reign the "coffee men" had been obliged to raise

<sup>1</sup> Ashton, i. 203-4.

wine, but Tories refused the port which had come in through the Methuen Treaty of 1703, taking Tokay, Hermitage, Florence, "Irish wine" (claret),<sup>1</sup> or champagne and Burgundy, if they could be got, but French wines were a luxury of the rich, or of those who could get smuggled goods. At the same time the drinking of "punch" became fashionable: pale ale, bitter beer, and "entire," a new kind of beer, at 3d. a quart, also date from this period.

Chamberlayne, in his "State of England," 1711, writes that French soups and kickshaws, venison, fish, and fowl were seldom



A WINE PARTY.

(From a Song-book of about 1737.)

eaten but by the better sort, the commonalty eating butcher's meat and puddings with more bread than formerly. Except at such great Ordinaries as Pontack's, where dinners ranged from four shillings a head to a guinea, it was possible to dine well for eighteenpence.<sup>2</sup> At a chop-house Swift got for tenpence gill-ale, bad broth, and three chops of mutton. At Spring Gardens the Burton Ale and hung-beef were famous.<sup>3</sup> Lent was still generally observed; Swift's fare in that season was furmity and butter, and herb porridge, Christmas-pies, and brawn were essential items.

<sup>1</sup> Swift, ii. 50.

<sup>2</sup> Sir H. Walpole on his grandfather's account book. "Letters," ed. Cunningham, i.

<sup>3</sup> *Spectator*, No. 83.



Life out of  
London.

The number of social centres on the outskirts of London and in the country steadily increased. In 1716 Pope writes from Twickenham :

"I have not dined but at great entertainments these ten days, in pleasant villas about the Thames, whose banks are now more populous than London, through the neighbourhood of Hampton Court."

The interest in landscape-gardening made many find entertainment in their country houses who formerly came to town. They were busy with opening avenues, cutting glades, planting firs, contriving waterworks, making grottoes, thatched temples, shelleries, marine temples, and so forth. House-parties assembled, and stayed for months at a time. The idea of retiring into the country for the purpose of enjoying rustic surroundings had not yet become fashionable, owing to the difficulty of procuring provisions.<sup>1</sup> But the towns of Bath, Tunbridge, Epsom, and, at the close of the period, Cheltenham, were full of fashionable people.<sup>2</sup> In 1714 Pope writes from Bath: "My whole day is shared by the pump, assemblies, the walks, the chocolate-houses, raffing-shops, plays, medleys, etc." Its promenade he calls one of the finest in the world. Girls complained that the society there in 1740 was very dull, all the morning spent in "How d'ye does?" all the afternoon in asking "What's trumps?" and the ladies' sole talk in the Ladies' Coffee House was of gout, sciatica, and rheumatism. Mrs. Pendarves, in 1741, writes of fine ladies at Cheltenham, "where the sober and sedate are terrified at any extraordinary word or action." At the close of the period sea-bathing at Scarborough was in vogue. The "new-fashioned way of conversing by assemblies" increased the gaiety of provincial life. In nearly all large towns the assizes, races, or fairs were the occasion of assemblies, balls, card-parties, raffing-shops and plays.<sup>3</sup> Cambridge was old-fashioned, and had none of these things.

The gay Elizabeth Robinson, afterwards Mrs. Montagu, writes:

"One visits in the country at the hazard of one's boues, but fear is never so powerful with me as to make me stay at home."

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Pope's "Letters," 1739

<sup>2</sup> *Universal Spectator*, May 6th, 1732; Chesterfield's "Letters," 1733.

<sup>3</sup> "Suffolk Correspondence," i. 256; Mrs. Montagu's and Mrs. Delany's "Letters," *passim*; Pennington's "Life of Elizabeth Carter" i. 27.



SCARBOROUGH SANDS IN 1735. (From a Contemporary Print.)

## Roads.

In 1730 (November 21st) the king and queen, coming from Kew Gardens to St. James's, were overturned in their coach near Lord Peterborough's at Parson's Green, about 6 p.m., the wind having blown out the flambeaux so that the coachman could not see his way.<sup>1</sup> In many places in England, turnpike-riots had already begun in 1736 (p. 174).<sup>2</sup>

Coaches  
and Inns.

The well-to-do rode in the flying stages and could do the journey from London to Exeter in three days, but poor travellers in the "stage-waggon" made very slow progress. No public conveyances travelled on Sundays, and in the North twenty-three miles a day was considered a fair rate of progress. Swift, creeping from Moor Park to Leicester in the waggon, slept at the penny hedge-inns, paying 6d. extra for clean sheets. Travellers with friends all over England expected hospitality at all great houses, even in the absence of the owner;<sup>3</sup> others less fortunate might lie

"In the worst inn's worst room, with mat half-hung,  
The floor of plaster and the walls of dung;  
On once a flockbed, but repaired with straw,  
With tape-tied curtains never meant to draw."<sup>4</sup>

Giddy girls like Elizabeth Robinson "squalled for joy" when they were overturned in the coach, but the dulness of the country caused older members of the family to suffer from "hyp," "nerves," and "vapours."

All ladies who had London friends did their shopping by letter, and many packets of tea, chocolate, and plays were made up like those of Mrs. Pendarves for her sister in Gloucestershire. In exchange she received consignments of potted lampreys. All dress materials, even lawn for babies' nightcaps, were sent from town. "As for pins, I think you must pay the compliment to Gloucester of buying them there."

A Lady's  
Life.

The delightful autobiography and letters of Mary Granville, by her first marriage Mrs. Pendarves, afterwards Mrs. Delany, give a vivid account both of country and town life seen from

<sup>1</sup> Hervey, "Memoirs," and *cf.* ii. 362 and ii. 101 on the impassableness of the roads that were not main roads to London; see also "Suffolk Correspondence," ii. 87 and i. 97, "cursed roads as all Cheshire is" (*sic*).

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, ii. 311.

<sup>3</sup> "Suffolk Correspondence."

<sup>4</sup> For an interesting list of inns and their merits on the road between London and Carlisle, 1719, see *Gentleman's Magazine*, 1762, p. 609.

the point of view of a well-bred lady. She was educated at a school kept by a French mistress, and among her fellow-pupils she found the daughters of noblemen, brewers, and actresses. Returning to her country home, Buckland, near Broadway, Gloucestershire, she worked at her music, reading, writing, French, and needlework in the morning, joined her father, mother, and the minister of the parish at whist in the evening, or pursued her favourite cut-paper work, for which she became celebrated, while her father read aloud. Throughout her life she was always busily employed with whatever "fancy work" was fashionable, either making sets of chairs in tent-stitch, shell-flowers, featherwork, spinning wool, flax, and silk, netting, knotting (the queen's habitual employment), or the like. She describes the house as covered with laurel outside, and within furnished with home-spun stuff, and adorned with fine china and prints.

She soon found a suitor, one "whose understanding was not much improved, his education that of a country squire"; but his suit was not sanctioned by his parents, the match was broken off, and he soon after died of grief. To distract her mind she went to winter with her relations, Lord and Lady Lansdowne, who had just been released from two years' imprisonment in the Tower, and were living at their country-seat near Bath. Here as a girl of seventeen she met Alexander Pendarves, a man of sixty—fat, snuffy, dirty, ugly, gouty and sulky. She found "his large unwieldy person and his crimson countenance subjects of great mirth and observation," till she learned, to her horror, that "Gromio," as she called him, was the husband her relations had chosen for her. She perceived it to be her duty to obey those who wished to see her "settled



MRS. DELANY, BY JOHN OPIE.  
(National Portrait Gallery.)

in the world, to ease her friends of an expense and care," and accepted him as cheerfully as she could. After marriage she continued to find him a "person rather disgusting than engaging," but she heroically concealed her hatred of him, and was at the utmost pains to oblige him. After many "overturns" of the chaise on the Cornish roads, at the end of the wedding journey she reached his home—an old castle whose hall had no windows, the floor of the parlour was rotten, and the ceiling broken down; what windows it had were placed high above her head.

After two years of marriage Gromio began to drink deeply, and when not suffering from gout, was brought home drunk at 6 a.m. The young wife's life in London was no happier, for she was an appropriate victim for the attacks of gallants, and she "stuck close to her spinet" for occupation, as she found the conduct of the men she met at assemblies a source of much annoyance.

**A Circle  
of Friends.**

During the period of her widowhood she spent much of her time with the Duchess of Portland, at Bulstrode, Bucks. The duchess had a gift for friendship, and gathered about her many bright, intelligent girls: a delightful correspondence passed between Pen (Mrs. Pendarves), Pip (her sister Anne), and Fidget (Elizabeth Robinson, afterwards Mrs. Montagu). Fidget had obtained an unusual amount of learning from Dr. Middleton at Cambridge, and the duchess and she read Cicero together.<sup>1</sup> Pen and Pip read the fashionable literature, the town lady giving advice to her country sister as to what books were worth buying and what were only worth hiring. It was the Duchess of Portland who rescued the learned Anglo-Saxon scholar, Elizabeth Elstob (p. 95), from penury, and made her governess to her children. In this position, though she found no scope for her extraordinary intellectual abilities, she was very happy, for she loved children.

**Children.**

It was no longer usual to administer corporal chastisement to children of the upper classes. An anecdote is told of Sarah Duchess of Marlborough's visit to the royal nursery, where she found the Princess (Queen Caroline) maintaining discipline.

<sup>1</sup> Writing of Mary Lepel (Lady Hervey) Chesterfield says, "She knows more than is necessary for any woman, for she understands Latin perfectly well, tho' she wisely conceals it."

One of the children, having been naughty, had just undergone wholesome correction after the German fashion, and was roaring piteously in consequence. The duchess tried hard to console it. "Ay, see there!" cried the prince, with an air of triumph, "you English are none of you well-bred, because you was not



**NATALE**      · ON THE  
**S. GREGORII** *Papæ.*      **BIRTH-DAY**  
                                          of St. Gregory.



Regonius  
 re halga  
 Papa En-  
 glicepe  
 peode A-  
 postolon

þætum andþearþan ðæge  
 æfter manigfealdum ge-



REGORY  
 the Holy  
 Father,  
 the Apo-  
 stle of  
 the Eng-

lish Nation, on this present  
 Day, after manifold La-

POPE GREGORY AND ELIZABETH ELSTOB.

(Elstob, "*Ælfrie's Homily on the Birthday of St. Gregory.*")

whipt when you was young." "Humph!" quoth her grace; "I thought to myself, I am sure *you* could not have been whipt when you were young, but I choked it in."<sup>1</sup>

Although children begin to play a larger part in the correspondence of the period, and to take more share in their parents' lives than hitherto, aristocratic children were still left

<sup>1</sup> "Introductory Anecdotes," Lady M. W. Montague, p. 103.

**Servants.** a great deal with servants, from whom they learned swearing and the singing of coarse ballads, while they played with their "babies" (dolls), "Dutch toys," and little "whirligigs."<sup>1</sup> The "Country Gentlemen's Vademecum" (1717)<sup>2</sup> gives the annual expenses of a nobleman's family of from twenty-five to thirty people as £1,200-£1,500, the wages of twenty servants amounting only to £170. Defoe, in his "Everybody's Business Nobody's Business" (1725), complains bitterly of the scarcity of women servants, and of the enormous wages they were demanding—



TOY SELLER.

(*Tempest*, "Cries of London.")

instead of 30s. or 40s. a year, they expect £6 or £8. He would like to see wages fixed at from £2 to £5, otherwise without a doubt they will soon be asking £20. Besides doubling her wages with vails, the cook gets the tradesman's poundage, so much in the pound for everything sent in to the house.

The writer calling himself Don Manoel Gonzales described the servants as the plague of almost every house in town. He charged them with forming confederacies and contributing to the maintenance of each other when out of place.

When the country girl arrived in London, he says, she becomes a fine London Madam, and can drink tea and take

snuff with the best. Indeed, she bargains for her tea twice a day before she takes a place.

The system of vails had passed into a byword. After dining with a friend,

"you'll find all the servants drawn up in the passage like a file of musketeers, from the house steward down to the lowest livery servant, and each of them holds out his hand to you in as deliberate a manner as the servants in our inns on the like occasion."

<sup>1</sup> Mrs. Montagu's Correspondence, i. p. 33.

<sup>2</sup> Quoted in Defoe, "Compleat English Gentleman," ed. Bülbiring

The master of the house turns his head away, and pretends not to notice what is going forward.<sup>1</sup> The queen thought it necessary to give vails in town as well as in the country, but the king told her she was a fool to do so.<sup>2</sup>

Westminster, under Dr. Freind's rule, and Eton were the two most aristocratic schools. In 1728 Westminster had 434 boys, and the majority were of good family.<sup>3</sup> But the quality of public school education was much criticised.



ETON COLLEGE, BY CANALETTO.

(From the painting [portion] in the National Gallery.)

The renewal of peace restored to the eldest son of a wealthy family his privilege of three years' foreign travel, which was to supply all the defects in his education. Horace Walpole, at the age of twenty-two, went with a party of friends (1739) to Paris for two months, Reims for three, then to Geneva, Turin, Genoa, Florence, Rome, Venice, from Genoa back to France by sea, and through the South of France to Orleans. France and Italy alone attracted the young travellers of the period. The love of making collections of curiosities led many

Travel  
Abroad.

<sup>1</sup> Le Blanc, "Travels," p. 111.

<sup>2</sup> Hervey, ii. 223.

<sup>3</sup> Wraxall, "Memoirs"; and Welch, "Alumni Westmonasteriensis."



"to view Italy knick-knackically," a danger against which Chesterfield warned his son. Lady Mary Wortley Montague, travelling in France (1739), found English, Scotch, and Irish families settled in all the provincial towns; at Dijon she found sixteen English families of distinction.

**Irregular  
Marriages.**

The state of the marriage-law, together with their own want of sobriety, led many young men of good family to ruin their lives by unions hastily entered into, secretly and irregularly, at one of the many exempt churches and chapels where no licence, banns, or formalities of any kind were required. The expense and ceremony of regular marriages, the extreme severity of class distinctions and of family supervision over both sexes and at all ages, tended to encourage clandestine matches. Poor Mrs. Pendarves, after seven years of "Gromio" and twenty years of widowhood, was nearly prevented from marrying the learned Dr. Delany because her brother considered that the Delany family was beneath theirs, but his reluctant consent was ultimately given, and the marriage was happy.

**Marriage  
Cere-  
monies.**

Regular marriages were accompanied with all the ceremonies of a past age; in 1736, when Frederick Prince of Wales was married, the males of the royal family undressed the prince, and the princesses the bride. Being in bed in a rich undress, she was visited by her father-in-law, and then by the bridegroom, in a nightgown of silver stuff and cap of the finest lace. The court was next admitted to see the bride and bridegroom sitting up in bed surrounded by all the royal family.<sup>1</sup> At this point in most households there followed the ceremony of flinging the stocking, scrambling for garters, and the drinking of sack posset.<sup>2</sup>

**Funerals.**

The funeral ceremonies were also unchanged. Old Lady Bute is described as sitting up in a mourning-bed, the room lighted by one taper, all her grandchildren standing at the foot of the bed, while a continuous stream of visitors passed through the room in silence, as a complimentary condolence on the death of Lord Bute. Every part of the house that visitors saw was completely draped with black. A black coach was necessary during mourning, and the soles of the shoes were blacked.<sup>3</sup> The

<sup>1</sup> Hervey, "Memoirs." i. 317; ii. 293.

<sup>2</sup> Misson, "Travels"; and Ashton, i. 40 *seq.*

<sup>3</sup> Verney, "Papers." ii. 16. Pepys *passim*, Thoresby, i. 81;

"Introductory Anecdotes," Lady M. W. Montague.

funeral generally took place at night, and the quality of the deceased was measured by the number of flambeaux. Each relative carried a bough, generally of rosemary, in one hand, and a link in the other, even when the funeral was by day. At the grave-side the boughs were thrown in and the flambeaux quenched in the soil. Gloves, scarves, and mourning rings were distributed to a wide circle of acquaintances.<sup>1</sup>

The law of Charles II. ordering all persons to be buried in woollen, for the encouragement of trade, was still in force, but



THE FUNERAL TICKET, BY WILLIAM HOGARTH.

the order was braved by some ladies, who were buried in Brussels lace "head," holland shift, with tucker and double ruffles, and new kid gloves.<sup>2</sup> Concerning mourning, Mrs. Pendarves writes from town to her sister three months after their father's death:—

"You should, if you keep strictly to the rules of mourning, wear your shammy gloves two months longer, but in the country, if it is more convenient to you, you may wear black silk; you might have worn black earrings and necklace these two months."

<sup>1</sup> Jorevin, in Grose, p. 585.

<sup>2</sup> Ashton, "Queen Anne," i. p. 49, note.

JAMES  
COLVILLE.  
Scotland:  
Political  
History.

THE Union, in completing the great organic change of the Revolution, presented many difficult political and social problems, the solution of which was left to the Scottish Whigs under Hanoverian rule. They were bitterly opposed by a Nationalist or Separatist party whose rallying cry was Repeal of the Union. This, and not the cause of the exiled family, was the real *raison d'être* of the Jacobites. It was aided by a quasi-Cavalier reaction from the sterner discipline of the Revolution saints. The Tory reaction of 1710, both in its dealings with the Church and with the Highland chiefs, was skilfully designed to nurse the rising of the Fifteen. And when George I. began his reign by unceremoniously setting his face against the Tories and dismissing Mar from the Scotch Secretaryship, he supplied the Jacobites with a leader. But their cause was from the outset doomed to failure. The Treaty of Utrecht, and the sudden deaths of Anne and Louis XIV., all worked powerfully in favour of the Hanoverian. Sheriffmuir proved only a meaner Killiecrankie, and the incapable leader that dared to provoke it missed the death that glorified his model, Dundee, and got off too easily with ignoble exile. Argyll, a general of the school of Marlborough and Stair, was, in integrity, patriotism, and military skill, a striking contrast to the Jacobite leader whom he defeated. Thanks to him, the triumph of the Government was complete, in spite of its own gross remissness. Sheriffmuir, Preston, and the recapture of Inverness all took place on one and the same day. The rising had no hold whatever on the people. Even Mar's own tenantry refused to join him. One can understand the Camerons, Macdonalds, and Mackenzies rallying from their lawless glens to the *tinchell*, or deer-hunt, on the Braes of Mar, at the call of an intriguing chief, but it is difficult to conceive why the great lowland lords—Keith-Marischal, Panmure, Southesk, Seton, Kenmure, Maxwell—imperilled their lives and their broad acres and rich rent-rolls for a worthless cause. Under better auspices they would have found a salve for their outraged Nationalist sympathies, and an outlet for their talents, in the warfare of Parliamentary opposition. The Government had no sooner got the Fifteen over than they put things in train for the Forty-five. Walpole, becoming all-powerful after

1719, reinstated Argyll, whom George I. had some time before ungratefully dismissed, and for years he or his brother, Lord Hlay, was virtually viceroy in Scotland. But the suppression of the rebellion left bitter memories in the promiscuous hanging of




PORTRAIT OF JAMES EDWARD, THE PRETENDER.

(*St. Mary's College, Blair, Aberdeen.*)

simple peasants after Preston, the deporting of crowds to the plantations, the assizes at Carlisle, the ignominy of marching well-born captives through London streets, and the beheadings on Tower Hill. The rebellion of 1715 ruined about fifty of the best families of the country, whose forfeited estates were

Effect of  
Confisca-  
tions.

entrusted to a commission of six sitting in Edinburgh, of whom four were English, Sir Richard Steele being one. The forced sales, under an Act drawn up by English lawyers, as usual oblivious of conditions prevailing outside their own ken, met with such tedious and expensive opposition that after four years the costs almost entirely swallowed up the proceeds. In 1719 an Assets Company—for the Joint Stock craze was in full swing—took over the forfeited properties, the surplus profits to be devoted to the improvement of the country. This Company was developed out of the York Buildings Company,



THE YORK WATER TOWER, FROM THE THAMES, BY SAMUEL SCOTT.

(From the painting [portion] in the National Gallery.)


originally formed (1675) to supply water to Piccadilly and St. James's Fields. The name was from the old town house of the see of York, on a site immediately east of Charing Cross. The Company dismantled many beautiful historic mansions like Seton and Leuchars Castles, introduced a few industries to a languid existence, and filled the pockets of Edinburgh lawyers by means of a rich crop of litigation.

Riots.

The Government was an unpopular system of corruption and repression. The spoils of office and parliamentary representation were in the hands of Ilay or his brother, Argyll. Robert Dundas, writing to his son, says, "I can write you nothing in the way of news, all our letters being opened in

the old way." Lord Advocate Craigie secured the Sutherland burghs through the ducal interest. His constituents were five delegates from the burghs, and his agent in Dingwall assured him that there was no argument there more powerful than brandy and claret. Robertson of Ochertyre tells us there was but one disputed election in Perth during George III.'s reign. The result was a strong independent Whig opposition, which Walpole's fiscal proposals made doubly unpopular. The rallying-cry was that of the Jacobites in Kelso market-place—"No union, no malt tax, no salt tax." The malt tax had been extended to Scotland in 1713, but not enforced till 1724, when even the Lord Advocate and the Secretary of State opposed it. Both were dismissed from office. The obnoxious exciseman was to come now nearer than ever to men's business and bosoms. In Glasgow, Campbell of Shawfield was specially unpopular for his support of Ilay in securing the tax. The mob sacked his town house (1725) in the Saltmarket. The riot was suppressed by the troops of Wade, not without bloodshed. It foreshadowed the better known Porteous riot of 1736, of some of the incidents of which Alexander Carlyle, then a student in Edinburgh, gives a graphic account.

In default of popular representation in Parliament, a good substitute was found in the annual Assembly of the Kirk, where were fought out the battles of the Argathelian, or Argyll party, and the Squadrone, or independent Whig opposition, who detested Walpole and repression. The toleration of Episcopacy and the odious Abjuration Oath sowed the seeds of dissension, for they brought the Church into conflict with that fertile stirrer



THE PORTEOUS RIOT.

("The Clergy's Plea of Conscience," 1737.)

Rise of  
Dissent.

up of trouble, the Cæsar of the State. The immediate result was the Reformed or Cameronian Church, the hero of which was Macmillan, minister of Balmaghie, in Kirkcudbright. The dramatic scene of the inauguration of the movement was a green knoll above Douglas in that upper Ward of Lanarkshire, whose bleak moors were full of memories of the Persecution. The restoration of lay patronage about the same time was also a fruitful source of heart-burning, and produced the Original Secession of 1733, under the leadership of Ebenezer Erskine. The real cause of this movement, however, was a more searching schism now developing itself within the Church itself, and precisely analogous to the rise of Methodism in England. Whitefield, indeed, on his visit to Scotland in 1741, fraternised with Erskine, and took part in the great open-air revival of the following year, known as the Cambuslang Wark. The two parties now arising—the Moderates and the Evangelicals, or High Flyers—revealed a characteristic feature of Scottish Dissent. Seceders always hived off as a protest against the innovating party of progress, declaring that, as true conservatives, they took with them the essential virtues of the Reformation. They felt themselves called upon to testify against the lukewarm indifference and backslidings of the Moderates. The Moderates had a majority of wealth and talent, yet Dissent never coincided with a cleavage of the classes of society, as has been so largely the case in England. Alongside the Church still existed the rival Scotch and English Episcopalians. The former were nonjuring to a man, and after the Fifteen their clergy suffered much. Burt says that, one Sunday morning, when King George was prayed for, the congregation rose up as one man and set about some such trivial action as snuffing. "*There was not a single response but our own, for the ritual was of the baldest.*"

Religion  
in the  
Country.

In the remoter Highland districts the Presbyterian clergy met with the greatest opposition. Æneas Sage, in the new parish of Loch Carron (1726), found modes of worship allied to Paganism, and the people so opposed to him as to try to set fire to the barn in which he lived. English observers, however, report that the Presbyterian clergy led regular and blameless lives, and were more revered than those in England. They preached in neckcloths and coloured cloaks, this being the rule,

except in the case of a professor of divinity, or one remarkable for age or gravity. "The Book of Common Order," says Calamy, "is now out of sight, and the devotions are often wild, incoherent, and extemporaneous." Extempore prayers produced much unseemly familiarity. During an unusually dry summer the minister of Leswalt in Wigtown had got into the habit of praying for rain, but one Sunday a farmer rushed up to him on entering the church, saying, "At your leisure, sir, wi' your refreshing showers. The hay o' Balquhirry is no a' gotten in yet." But there was no doubt that the Church all through this time kept a firm hold on social life. A grave decorum marked even the week-days. Elizabeth Mure (born 1714) says that in her youth all the respectable kept the evangelical creed, going regularly to church on Sunday and observing daily family worship. "While reverence and awe remained for masters, fathers, and heads of clans, it was then that the awe and dread of Deity was most powerful." Piety was sincere, though we may well believe it to be exaggerated. On the other hand, there were atheistical clubs in the capital—such as the Hell Fire, the Sulphur Society, the Demirep Dragoons. The Government issued edicts against them, probably because they were supported by Jacobite roysterers. Their existence makes us believe in what Elizabeth Mure says: "The fear of Hell and the deceitful power of the Devil was at the bottom of all their religious sentiments." It was indeed an age of striking contrasts.

Hell-Fire  
Clubs.

The third decade of the century seems to have been the period when the Lowland gentry woke up from the sleep of ages, and were seized with that spirit of rural improvement which in time transformed the face of the country. The return of the exiles from their long sojourn in Holland and the increased intercourse with England led to a general elevation of the standard of living. The effects were first noticed in the Lothians, where the building of mansions, formation of parks and gardens, planting of ornamental woods, reclamation of waste lands, all marked a distinctly higher civilisation. The lawyers of Edinburgh and the new official class generally largely benefited by the Union, and soon began to supplant the old territorial magnates and import a higher intelligence into the management of land. Hence from this period date those beautiful *pleasaunces*

State  
of the  
Country



in the Lothians which charmed travellers like Macky and Defoe. Even to far distant Moray we find a Quaker gardener at Holyrood sending (1718) a most extensive assortment of the seeds of useful and ornamental shrubs and trees, and all the garden stuffs grown at the present day. The Queen Anne fashion of grottoes, too, spread northwards along with those *wildernesses* in which art improved upon nature. These lairds, too, attacked the farming customs that had been unchanged for centuries. The Society of Improvers in Agriculture began operations in 1723, leasing an extensive morass in what is now the Meadows or south side of Edinburgh for experiments. They recommended fallowing, draining, lining, and enclosing, but the greatest revolution was effected by the introduction of clover and sown grasses, thus making it possible to dispense with staff-herding and save stock from the semi-starvation of winter. Lord Belhaven's "Countryman's Rudiments" (1726) describes the existing condition of East Lothian as primitive in the extreme, a condition which was to last a long time yet among the peasant farmers, who looked upon improvements as only for lairds with pet notions in their heads. The first note of the social bearings of coming agrarian change is the Galloway Enclosure Riots of 1723. The landlords, anxious to rear cattle for the southern markets, turned out many of the poor tenants from their holdings. Two troops of dragoons from Edinburgh broke up the bands of Levellers and Houghers, and widespread distress followed, aggravated by the losses of the Mississippi and South Sea schemes (p. 169). The real obstacle to improvement was the survival of the feudal system of land tenures, which, by exacting rents in kind from tenants-at-will, made landlords unprogressive and peasants thriftless.

Barley-  
Mills and  
Potatoes.

In spite of all this, however, real progress was made, at least in the Lowlands, where we hear of two novelties destined to increase enormously the general happiness. For ages the "knockin stane" had been found at every cottage door. In this the husks of the barley had to be beaten off with a mallet to prepare it for the *kail* (vegetable broth), which formed the universal midday meal. Andrew Fletcher, however, brought from Holland, at great pains and even risk, the pot-barley mill, and erected it at Saltoun, in East Lothian. During most of the century the Saltoun mills supplied the whole country with pot-

barley. Of greater moment was the introduction of the potato from Ireland. During the first quarter of the century potatoes are occasionally mentioned as a rarity. In 1739 they were first planted in the open field near Kilsyth by Graham of Tamrawer. A pedlar, Henry Prentice, introduced them into the Lothians shortly afterwards, where they were pretty general by 1760.

This period is noticeable for the first serious attempts to deal with the Highland question. The wolf was not long extinct in

The  
Highlands



LAURISTON HOUSE, THE RESIDENCE OF JOHN LAW.

the mountains, Ewan Cameron of Lochiel having killed the last in 1680. James VI. had tried to restrain the chiefs by keeping their children in the Lowlands, where they were educated. The Church after the Revolution followed with a scheme for introducing schools into the Highlands, where the peasantry had been kept in dense ignorance. On the other hand, it is difficult to reconcile the dignity and refinement of the gentry with their lawless and semi-savage practices. Tutors from the south were to be found in the houses even of the lesser gentry or tacksmen. Honest labour, the while, was despised, and plundering deemed

Roads and  
Travel.

only an exciting sport. Specially after the Fifteen lawlessness was at its worst. A *creagh*, or cattle raid, was too often popular, above all if at the expense of the peaceful tenants of the great Whig lords, Montrose in the Lennox, and the fertile lands of Moray and Ross. The Independent Companies of loyal clans were tried, but disbanded in 1717 under the Disarming Act. An armed police was then formed under loyal leaders, and these, being clad in the dark native tartan, were called Reicudan Dhu, or Black Watch, in contrast to the Sidier Roy (red), or regular soldiers, who had been placed as garrisons in the worst districts, such as Fort Augustus (1717), Ruthven in Badenoch, and Glenelg on the Sound of Sleat (1726). From the native companies was formed the famous Black Watch, or 42nd Regiment, first enrolled at Aberfeldy in 1740. In all these matters the Government was mainly guided by Lord-Advocate Forbes of Culloden. Had his further advice been taken of recruiting Highlanders for service with the army abroad, afterwards put in force by Chatham, it would have made the Forty five impossible. The most effective mode of reducing disorder, however, was Wade's roads (1726-37). Travelling all over the country was then a matter of supreme difficulty. Two Glasgow merchants, going on horseback to London in 1739, found no turnpike till they came to Grantham, 110 miles from the capital. To that point they travelled on a narrow causeway with an unmade soft road on each side. They passed great strings of packhorses on the way. Steele, going to Scotland, hired a Frenchman to teach him French by the way. Wade connected Crieff and Perth with Fort Augustus, and Inverness by two main roads, which, however, crossed the Grampians as one from Dalnacardoch to Dalwhinnie. A continuation of the system connected Inverness, Fort Augustus and Fort William, passing down Glenmore. Wade constructed in all 250 miles of road 16 ft. wide, erected good huts along the route, and built 40 bridges, the finest of which was at Aberfeldy, on the model of Stirling Bridge. The work employed in summer 500 soldiers. As engineer officer under him Wade had Burt, the writer of those "Letters from the Highlands" which present such an admirable picture of the social condition of the country at the time.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Burt regarded Highland scenery with horror, which is at least more tolerable than Samuel Johnson's contempt. He tells how some brother

The remarkable rise of Glasgow after the Union marks a new departure. Trade began on a small scale in sugar, herring, coarse woollens, and a little tobacco, carried on in ships hired from Whitehaven. Goods, brought up the shallow river in lighters, or *gabars*, were conveyed mostly to Bo'ness on Forth by horse pack. In this way, as the trade grew, the Continent was mainly supplied with tobacco through the Virginia Dons, as the Glasgow merchants were called. This trade became so formidable that we find Bristol and Liverpool petitioning Parliament (1721) with the view of crushing it. Not till 1718, however, had Glasgow ships of her own crossing the Atlantic. The young Scots factors, generally of good family, engaged in this trade did much to open up the colonies in the West. Manufactures developed in connection with trade, and looms were set agoing after 1725 for linen. An Act, passed in 1727, to encourage manufactures and fisheries, caused the exports to rise rapidly, especially of linens. About the same time the thread industry of Paisley took its rise. Christian Shaw, daughter of the laird of Bargarran near by, and chief agent in the burning of the witches at Paisley, developed uncommon talent in spinning and bleaching linen thread, for which Lady Blantyre found a ready market among the lace-makers of Bath. One of the family, while in Holland, learned the secrets of the industry, and thus further contributed to make Bargarran thread famous all over the country. Here, and in Glasgow too, long flourished *inkle*, or linen-tape making, another capture from Holland, Alex. Harvie having succeeded at great risk in smuggling two looms and a workman out of Haarlem. Another romance of industry is recorded on a tombstone in the village of Dunlop, telling how Barbara Gilmour, driven with her goodman to Ireland in "the dark and drublie dayes of Charles II.," there learned the making of sweet milk cheese, and on her return in better times introduced dairying into Ayrshire. To the family of Duncan

officers had the courage to ascend Ben Nevis. This, with Brodie's account in a letter to Wodrow (1702), must surely be the earliest record of mountaineering in the island. These were not the days for any appreciation of hill scenery. Of the Highland hills Burt says, "The whole appear of a dismal gloomy brown, drawing upon a dirty purple, and most of all disagreeable when the heath is in bloom. They show rugged, irregular lines against the sky-line, extremely harsh to the eye."

Forbes, who did so much for Scottish trade, we owe the rise of what is now a great national industry. Their estates near Inverness having been much wasted during the Revolution troubles that closed with Killiecrankie, the family obtained the privilege of distilling whiskey from grain raised on their lands of Ferintosh, in Ross-shire, on payment of a small composition in lieu of excise. Ferintosh was for long a synonym for whisky. The Yorks Company made many attempts to develop the native resources. On the Grant estates their agent, the notorious Aaron Hill, tried (1728) on a wasteful scale to turn the vast fir forests of Speyside to some account. Here he introduced rafting instead of the primitive custom he found in use of guiding the trees down stream in coracles.<sup>1</sup> For centuries the east coast of Scotland had supplied the Low Countries with fish. The trade was entirely in the hands of the Dutch, greatly to the annoyance of Scottish patriots. To the Great Fishing, as it was called, came hundreds of Dutch busses in the summer months. In one summer 2,000 had been seen at one time in Bressay Sound. They drove a great trade in bartering goods for fish, stockings, and food products. Till 1806 Dutch and Danish coins were commoner than British in Lerwick. Not till 1826 was there any quantity of fish cured by the Shetlanders for export.

Social  
Life in  
Edinburgh.

All that was characteristic and picturesque in the age we find concentrated in the social life of the capital. Fortunately, we have a parallel to Pope and the *Spectator* in Allan Ramsay, who came to Edinburgh in 1701, and died there in 1758. His inauguration of the "Easy Club" (1712) marked the introduction into exclusive Jacobite society of this poetic book-seller and pushing eupeptic bourgeois. The "Evergreen" (1724) led directly to the great revival of Scottish literature, and indirectly to the whole Romantic movement. Though Ramsay was lost in admiration of Pope and Steele and Gay, he had good sense and natural instincts enough to appreciate the remains of what the Correct School called a barbarous age. The "Gentle Shepherd," which immediately followed (1725), is the happiest compromise of the day between the "vulgar"

<sup>1</sup> Of hides over a wicker framework. They were in use on the Spey till the end of the eighteenth century. Cf. Vol. I. of this work, p. 19.

and the "genteel," and a delightful picture of rural manners. In his shop, at the east end of the Luckenbooths, where he looked out upon the Cross and the noisy High Street, he laid the foundation of the literary celebrity of Old Edinburgh, and brightened the life of that *dour* time in its convivial clubs, outdoor sports and attractions of music and the stage. In the tortuous steep street the West Bow, headquarters of the Bow-head Saints and "Tinkler Billies," whom Robert Ferguson has celebrated, the first assembly for dancing was established, about 1710, and here it continued till 1746. A letter from a lady in Donibristle, seat of the Earl of Moray, nestling pleasantly among the Aberdour woods on Forth, to her friend in Morayshire, gives an interesting note of such festivities. "Every Thursday," the writer says, "there is a meeting for dancing, at 4 p.m. The ticket is half-a-crown, and you pay for tea, coffee, or chocolate and biscuit. The manageresses are Countess Panmure, Lady Newhall, etc. The clergy are preaching against it." The teaching of dancing soon followed. In 1728 the Lovers of Music formed a society for weekly concerts in the evenings, and two years later Craig made a collection of Scotch tunes for harp and spinet, the first of its kind. But it was in connection with the stage that the most daring advances were made. Here Allan Ramsay met with opposition akin to the Puritan hostility to Shakespeare. Under his auspices the first regular company, Tony Aston's, played (1725-6) such pieces as *The Mourning Bride* and *The Beggar's Opera*. Wodrow writes with horror of Aston's stage as "a dreadful corrupter of our youth and an eyelet to prodigality and vanity." In



ALLAN RAMSAY.

(Scottish National Portrait Gallery.)

of dancing soon followed. In 1728 the Lovers of Music formed a society for weekly concerts in the evenings, and two years later Craig made a collection of Scotch tunes for harp and spinet, the first of its kind. But it was in connection with the stage that the most daring advances were made. Here Allan Ramsay met with opposition akin to the Puritan hostility to Shakespeare. Under his auspices the first regular company, Tony Aston's, played (1725-6) such pieces as *The Mourning Bride* and *The Beggar's Opera*. Wodrow writes with horror of Aston's stage as "a dreadful corrupter of our youth and an eyelet to prodigality and vanity." In

1736 Allan himself opened the New Theatre in Carubber's Close, but was met with an old Act against rogues and vagabonds, and had to close, after a heavy loss. Out of doors, the sports that live in Allan's verses show that to the citizen there was sometimes light and leisure. On the still open ground of Kirk o' Field, to the south of the city, there were numerous bowling-greens. Near by archery was practised in the Meadows. Farther off there was golf, on Bruntsfield, and tennis, near Holyrood; while there was always that Greenwich Park of the North, Leith Links and Sands, for golf, horse-racing, and popular carnivals. A spirit of civic improvement, too, was abroad, of which the chief fruit was the building of the Royal Infirmary, begun in 1735; and with it grew up the medical fame of the city under Alexander Monro, who had opened a class for anatomy in 1720. The moving spirit in these improvements was George Drummond, thrice Lord Provost. His name is best known in connection with the New Town, of which we have the first distinct conception from the Earl of Mar, who, about 1715, drew up an interesting scheme of improvements, many of which were adopted by Drummond.

**Culture.**

The age was favourable to individuality and odd contrasts, for neither education, reading, nor travel had as yet done much to produce uniformity. The upper classes were seeking for something better than the coarse manners of the old grammar schools, for we note about this time the rise of provincial boarding-schools, such as that Scotch Eton at Dalkeith, where the first President Dundas had his boys, an example followed by many more of the gentry of the Lothians. There was much, indeed, to brutalise the young. The Candlemas cockfights at schools were honoured institutions. The coarse treatment of habitual offenders by ducking, scourging, brandings, the frequent hangings, all these tended in the same direction. The grammar school of Aberdeen, to its credit, was now making special efforts, by janitors and censors, to improve the minor morals of the scholars. But the most significant note of all was the new demand for female education. In the universities the old tutorial system of regenting had quite given place to the professorial system under which each teacher lectured upon his own

special subject. A succession of brilliant men, like the Monros, Gregorys, and Maclaurin, gave to Edinburgh great repute in medicine and science. Law and the Church formed the only careers open to young men of talent. Not till Chatham's days did Scots abroad find scope for their talents in war and colonising; so now we find them in the schools of Leyden and Utrecht, thereafter making fame and fortune at the Bar at home, buying estates, becoming improvers, and giving a refined flavour to the Jacobite society of the capital. After the Revolution, William's policy of absorbing into the Church



DONIBRISTLE.

the illiterate curates of the North is said to have lowered the tone of the clergy. Licentiates found employment as tutors and chaplains in manor-houses, where they often met with as little respect as the Levite of Queen Anne's days. On the skirts of the learned class hung the poor scribe, who greeted every event of unusual domestic interest with his poetic effusions. The first catalogue of the Advocates' Library, founded in 1682, by Sir George Mackenzie, appeared in 1742, and showed a collection of 40,000 volumes. Popular reading got its first impetus from Allan Ramsay, who has the credit of beginning a circulating library, in 1728. The *Scots' Magazine*, modelled on the *Gentleman's*, made its appearance in 1739. For some time after the Union Edinburgh had three



newspapers, of which the *Courant* was Whig and the *Caledonian Mercury* Jacobite. Besides these, news-letters, such as the *Flying Post* and the *Gazette*, found their way to remote country houses. Correspondence was carried on under considerable difficulty. Burt had to spare the names of particular persons, his foot-runner being liable to be intercepted by, apparently, Breadalbane, as he darkly hints. And when the messenger reached town he had to trust to those *serviceable vagabonds* the caddies for delivery, when addresses were like these: "Mr. Arch. Dunbar of Thunderton to be left at Capt. Dunbar's



MEDAL OF ROBERT FOULIS.

(*Scottish National Portrait Gallery.*)

writing chamber at the Iron revell 3rd story below the Cross and north end of the Close at Edinburgh"; or, again, "Capt. Philip Anster of Newgrange at his lodging a little above the Fortune Well, south side of the street, Edinburgh." Printing had long been in a low state, due to the pernicious monopoly granted to one Anderson, a relic of the bad days of the Restoration. But William

Ged, an Edinburgh goldsmith, worked as early as 1725 at stereotyping, and in a tall land on the south side of the High Street produced an edition of Sallust in 1736, the first example of the art. By 1740 Wilson, a professor of astronomy at Glasgow, had produced the first types north of the Tweed, and with his help the brothers Foulis, of Glasgow, brought out eighteen editions of the classics between 1741 and 1747. Within this period falls the last case of witch-burning, that of a poor woman at Dornoch, in Sutherland (1727), and in 1736 the Act against witches, which had been silently growing effete, was repealed. The Associate Synod of 1742 testified against this proceeding as a symptom of latitudinarianism.

P. W.  
JOYCE.  
Ireland.

THE repressive legislation against Ireland which followed the revolution (IV., p. 847, *seq.*) had produced the natural results, and at the opening of the present period the country was in a most deplorable state. The Catholics were crushed by the enactments specially aimed at them; and Catholics and Protestants alike were impoverished by the destruction of trade. There was little business of any kind, and the working classes starved for want of employment. The hostile attitude of the English Government produced, among other evils, the same result as in old times (III., p. 409, *seq.*), a feeling of distrust and aversion; and the Protestant people, seeing their rights as citizens unjustly curtailed, and themselves in consequence reduced to poverty, were even more bitterly hostile and disaffected than the Catholics, who at this time scarcely expected anything more than the right to live. As a body the Irish Parliament shared in the general discontent; but it was powerless to stem the tide of ruin. Some years before (in 1703) the Parliament, fearing that the continued, selfish jealousy of English traders might lead to further destructive legislation against Ireland, had petitioned for parliamentary union with England, hoping to fare better if they had a voice in the English Legislature; but the petition was rejected. But soon after the opening of the present period there was further cause for exasperation. In a dispute about some property between two Irish litigants—commonly known as the “Annesley Case”—the English House of Lords, on being appealed to, reversed the decision of the Irish Lords, who, however, attempted to enforce their own decision; whereupon the English Parliament ended the dispute by passing, in 1719, a momentous Act, known as the “Sixth of George I.,” depriving the Irish Lords of the right to hear appeals, and deciding that the English Parliament had the right to make laws for Ireland. This last right, which, it may be observed, was not included in Poyning’s Law, was now asserted for the first time.

Lost  
Rights.


But there were many thoughtful and just-minded Protestant Irishmen who bitterly resented the subjection of their Parliament and the destruction of their rising trade; and from time to time there was serious resistance both in and out of Parliament. Many years before (in 1698) William

Irish  
Cham-  
plions.  
Molyneux  
and Swift.

Molyneux, one of the members for the University of Dublin, denounced with great ability the commercial injustice done to Ireland, and asserted the absolute independence of the Irish Parliament and its exclusive right to make laws for Ireland, and his pamphlet was publicly burned by the hangman. But by far the ablest of these Irish defenders of their country was Jonathan Swift (p. 102). In 1722 the English Treasury, without consulting the Irish Parliament, granted to one William Wood (p. 153) a patent to coin £108,000 in debased halfpence and farthings for circulation in Ireland, which would put £40,000 into the pockets of Wood and the king's favourite, the Duchess of Kendal. This attempt at a gross job was resisted with the utmost indignation in Ireland by all classes, from the Houses of Parliament down; notwithstanding which it would probably have succeeded but for Swift. His "Drapier's Letters" excited the country to such a pitch that the patent for "Wood's Halfpence" had to be withdrawn.

Arch-  
bishop  
Boulter.

About this time the then Primate, Hugh Boulter, who, from being the king's chaplain had been promoted to the archbishopric of Armagh, was entrusted with the chief management of the English interests in Ireland. He was bitterly hostile to the Roman Catholics, but was otherwise a good man. It was chiefly through his influence that the Catholics were disfranchised (IV., p. 848). Finding his efforts to induce the Catholics to conform unavailing, he tried another device. In 1730 he induced the Government to found the "Charter Schools," for educating poor Roman Catholic children in the Protestant faith; but these schools, though long maintained and subsidised by the Government, effected very little.



ONE OF WOOD'S HALFPENNY.

## AUTHORITIES.—1714-1742.

## GENERAL HISTORY.

Lecky, *History of England in the Eighteenth Century*; Lord Mahon, *History of England*, 1713-83; Hearn, *The English Constitution*; Dicey, *Law and Custom of the Constitution*; Morley, *Walpole*. On foreign affairs in particular: Coxe, *History of the Bourbons in Spain and History of the House of Austria*; Wiesener, *Le Régent, l'Abbé Dubois, et les Anglais*; Aubertin, *L'Esprit Public au XVIII<sup>e</sup>me Siècle*; Jobez, *La France sous Louis XV.*; Armstrong, *Elizabeth Farnese*; Seeley, *Expansion of England, and Growth of British Policy*; Hassall, *The Balance of Power*, 1713-1789; Innes, *Britain and her Rivals*, 1713-1789; W. Frewen Lord, *The Lost Possessions of England*.

## SPECIAL SUBJECTS.

*Military History*.—Wright, *Life of Wolfe*; Parkman, *Montcalm and Wolfe*; Innes, *Britain and her Rivals*; Stedman, *History of the American War*; Bancroft, *History of the United States*; Capt. J. Knox, *Historical Journal of the Campaign in North America*, 1757-60 [London, 1869; he served under Wolfe].

*The Navy*.—Charnock, *Naval Architecture and Biographia Navalis*; Derrick, *Memoirs of the Royal Navy*; Campbell, *Lives of the Admirals*; J. Cowley, *Sailor's Companion* (1740); Blanckley, *Naval Expositor* (1750); Falconer, *Marine Dictionary*; *The Historical Register*; the *Naval Histories* of Burchett, Lediard, and Schomberg; and Sir W. Laird Clowes, *The Royal Navy, a History*.

*Exploration*.—See list appended to c. xix.

*Law*, 1688-1742.—The text of the statutes cited; Blackstone, *Commentaries on the Laws of England*; Fitzjames Stephen, *History of the Criminal Law of England*; Copinger, *The Law of Copyright*; Morris, *A Summary of the Law of Land and Mortgage Registration*, and the authorities therein enumerated.

*Science and Philosophy*.—Whewell, *History and Philosophy of the Inductive Sciences*; *Encyclopædia Britannica*, articles "Chemistry" and "Electricity"; Ueberweg, *History of Philosophy*; Erdmann, *History of Philosophy*; Leslie Stephen, *English Thought in the Eighteenth Century*; and the works of the philosophers mentioned. On Berkeley and Hume, see the introductions by T. H. Green to his ed. of Hume's works.

*Medicine and Public Health*.—Sidney Young, *Annals of the Barber-Surgeons of London* (1890); South, *Memorials of the Craft of Surgery*, ed. by D'Arcy Power, M.A.; C. Creighton, *History of Epidemics in Britain*; Glaister, *Dr. William Smellie and his Contemporaries* (Glasgow, 1893); Mather, *Two Great Scotsmen* (William and John Hunter) (Glasgow, 1894); R. H. Semple, *Memoirs of the Botanic Gardens at Chelsea belonging to the Society of Apothecaries of London* (1878); Wilks and Bettany, *Biographical History of Guy's Hospital*; Dr. T. F. Payne, *Address on Epidemiology in England and Introduction to the reprint of William Boghurst's Loimographia: an account of the Great Plague of London*, in *Transactions of the Epidemiological Society of London*, New Series, vol. xiii. (1894).

*English Scholarship, 1570-1742*.—A sketch of the general history of classical scholarship, divided into periods with the names of the leading representatives of various nations in each, is given by Urlichs in Iwan Müller's *Handbuch*, i. 39-126b (1886). Incidental criticisms on the works of English scholars are included in Hallam's *Literature of Europe*; biographical details in the current dictionaries, and (for part of this period) in Nichols, *Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century*; lists of published works, with dates, in Freund's *Triennium Philologicum*, i., pp. 21-112 (1874), and Pökel's *Philologisches Schriftsteller-Lexikon* (1882). On Bentley, apart from his own works and his correspondence, published by Burney (1817), Friedemann (1825), C. Wordsworth (1842), and others, the principal authorities are the *Life* by Bishop Monk (ed. ii. 1833) and *Richard Bentley* by J. Mahly (1868); and Professor Jebb's biography in

the *English Men of Letters Series* (1882). There are notices of Bentley, Markland, Taylor, Toup and Tyrwhitt in F. A. Wolf's *Analekten* (1817-20), reprinted in Wolf's *Kleine Schriften*, ed. Bernhardt (1869); and a paper on Dawes by Mr. Giles in the *Emmanuel College Magazine*, vol. v., pp. 49-69. On the study of Anglo-Saxon at this period, the best sketch is that of Kemble in Francisque Michel's *Bibliothèque Anglo-Saxonne* (Paris and London, 1837).

*Literature and Art.*—See list appended to c. xviii.

*Handel and English Music.*—J. C. Smith, *Anecdotes of Handel*; R. Clark, *Reminiscences of Handel*; *Lives of Handel* by Schoelcher, W. S. Rockstro, Chrysander, and Bray; article, "Handel," in Sir G. Grove's *Dictionary of Music*; article, "Handel: Man and Musician," in *Blackwood's Magazine* (1894).

*Agriculture, 1715-1815.*—Jethro Tull, *New Horse-hoeing Husbandry* (1733); Dr. E. Rigny, *Holkham: its Agriculture* (1818); *Journals of the Royal Agricultural Society*, vols. iii.-vi., viii., xvi., xvii., xxiii.; Arthur Young, *Tours* (1768-80) and *Travels in France* (1794); also his *Farmer's Letters to the People of England* (1768-71), *Rural Economy* (1770), *Political Arithmetic* (1774); *Husbandry of Three Celebrated English Farmers* (Bakewell, Arbuthnot, and Duckett) (1811); Marshall, *Rural Economy of Norfolk* (1787); of *Yorkshire* (1788); of *Gloucestershire* (1789); of *the Midland Counties* (1790); of *the West* (1796); of *the South* (1798); and the *Agricultural Surveys of Great Britain and Ireland* (1793-96 and 1804-13).

*Manufacturing and Mining.*—On Silk Weaving, see Rees, *Encyclopædia*, article "Silk"; *Dictionary of National Biography*, article "Lombe"; *Tracts Relating to Trade*, in the British Museum (pressmark 816 m. 12, and subsequent vols.); J. Apletre, *Proposals for an Undertaking to Produce Raw Silk*. On Wool: J. Bischoff, *History of the Woollen and Worsted Manufacture*; W. Haynes, *Great Britain's Glory*. On Ceramics and Glass: F. Haudicquer de Blancourt, *Art of Glass*; and numerous tracts. On Iron: H. Scrivenor, *History of the Iron Trade*; J. Percy, *Iron and Steel*; *Dict. of National Biography*, article "Darby"; and tracts.

*Finance, etc.*—*Modern Works*: Lord Mahon's and Lecky's histories (see above); Cunningham's *English Industry and Commerce*; Rogers, *Economic Interpretation of History*; Dowell, *History of Taxes and Taxation*. Cannan, *History of Local Rates*. *Contemporary Authorities*: Hervey, *Memoirs* (best account of Walpole's Excise Scheme); Horace Walpole, *Reminiscences, Memoirs, and Letters*; Defoe on *Loans* (Somers Tracts); Anderson, *History of Commerce* (for South Sea Scheme); original documents in Coxe, *Walpole*.

*Pauperism and Labour.*—Burn, *History of the Poor Laws*, is the best book up to the date he wrote (1764); thence to 1796 Eden's great work, which also gives documents for the earlier period. For the condition of the various classes and districts, see Defoe's *Tour* (1724), supplemented by Lord Hervey's *Memoirs*, Horace Walpole, and the *Gentleman's Magazine*, with the Parliamentary Debates. Modern books: Cunningham, *English Industry and Commerce*; W. C. Sydney, *England in the Eighteenth Century*, Thorold Rogers, *Six Centuries of Work and Wages* and *The Economic Interpretation of History*; Lecky, *History of England*; Webb, *Trades Unions*; and Nichols, *History of the English Poor Laws*, ed. Willink.

*Social Life.*—*The Court*: John, Lord Hervey, *Memoirs of the Court of George II.* (ed. Croker); Jesse, *Memoirs of the Courts of England*; Walpole, *Reminiscences*; Stone, *Chronicles of Fashion*. *London*: Fielding, *Covent Garden Journal*; Timbs, *Club Life*; works entitled *London*, by Malcolm, Dr. Doran, and Jesse; Dasent, *History of St. James's Square*. *Bath*: Goldsmith, *Beau Nash*; Peach, *Ralph Allen*; *Historic Houses in Bath*; *Tours*, by Defoe and Macky. *Post*: Malet, *Annals of the Road*. *General*: the works of Pope, Gay, Swift, Defoe, and Fielding; the *Gentleman's Magazine*; Andrews, *Eighteenth Century*; Miller, *Retrospect of the Eighteenth Century*; John Chamberlayne, *Present State of England* (1748); Angeloni, *Letters on the English* (1755); Nichols, *Literary Anecdotes*; and various collections of correspondence—e.g. the *Letterbook of Lord Hervey, First Earl of Bristol*; *Letters of Horace Walpole* (ed. Peter

Cunningham), of Lady Mary Lepel Hervey (ed. T. W. Croker), of Swift, Lady Suffolk, Mrs. Montagu, Lord Chesterfield, Mrs. Delany; Pennington, *Elizabeth Carter*.

Scotland, 1714-42.—Burt, *Letters* (Jamieson's ed. has the Gartmore MSS., 1747); Hill Burton, *Lives of Simon Fraser, Lord Lovat, and of Duncan Forbes*; Crawford, *Renfrewshire*; Hamilton, *Sheriffdom of Lanark* (1710); *Reminiscences of Maxwell of Mumbles* (new *Statistical Account of Scotland*, vol. iv.); Lord Belhaven, *Countryman's Rudiments* (1723); Gordon, *Northern Itinerary* (1726); Murray, *Yorks Building Company* (1883); Ker of Kersland, *Secret Services* (1726-7); *The Earl of Mar's Legacies, 1722-1727* (Scottish History Society); A. Lang, *Pickle the Spy*; Prof. Story, *Memoirs of Robert Story* (1725-50); Erskine (Lord Prestongrange), *Diary of a Senator in the College of Justice* (1717-8); President Forbes, *Report on a Visit to the West Highlands* (1737) (App. Crofters' Commission Report, 1884); Burgh Records of Aberdeen, Stirling, Prestwick. *Social Life*: Allan Ramsay's Poems; Dunbar, *Social Life in Moray*; Scott, *Heart of Midlothian*.

Ireland.—See list appended to c. xix.



MEDAL ON SWIFT AND THE IRISH COINAGE.

## CHAPTER XVIII.

## AN ERA OF NEW DEPARTURES. 1742-1784.

ARTHUR  
HASSALL.  
Domestic  
Politics :  
Wilmington's  
Ministry.

ON Walpole's resignation Lord Wilmington (Sir Spencer Compton) became First Lord of the Treasury, Sandys Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Lord Carteret succeeded Harrington as one of the Secretaries of State. The other Secretary, Newcastle, with Henry Pelham, Hardwicke, and Young, kept their offices, and Argyle was reinstated as Master of the Horse. The new ministry was a sort of coalition of the Whigs, all Tories being strictly excluded from the arrangement. Pulteney refused to take office, and retired to the Upper House as Lord Bath. Walpole took the title of Lord Orford, and Carteret became the most important member of the Government, and virtual Prime Minister.

The Re-  
vival in  
Religion  
and  
Politics.

During the ensuing years England experienced a religious no less than a political awakening. Both movements, of which the leaders were respectively John Wesley (p. 317) and William Pitt, represented a reaction against the deadening influence of Walpole's system upon Church and State. From Walpole's fall, too, must be dated the definite beginning of the struggle by the people to convert the House of Commons from an oligarchic body into a popular assembly in touch with the nation, and the growth of the corporate responsibility of members of the Cabinet. Beyond the appointment of a committee to inquire into the conduct of the late Prime Minister, and the passage of a Place Bill to limit the number of offices tenable by members of Parliament—a Bill which had a salutary effect in checking the royal influence—the domestic policy of the new Government was in no way noteworthy. On the death of Wilmington in July, 1743, it was dissolved.

After an attempt on the part of Lord Bath, supported by Carteret, to become Prime Minister, Henry Pelham, a repre-

sentative of the party of Walpole, succeeded Wilmington. The new ministry soon found themselves out of touch with Carteret's complicated foreign policy, and, irritated at his

Pelham's  
Ministry.



*Photo: Walker & Cockerell.*

THE RIGHT HON. HENRY PELHAM, BY W. HOARE, R.A.

*(National Portrait Gallery.)*

arrogance and suspicious of his projects, they insisted on his withdrawal from the Government in November, 1744. His retirement was followed by that of Lord Winchilsea and others, and Pelham was then able to establish the Broad-Bottom Administration by introducing into the Government Whigs



like Harrington, who succeeded Carteret, Grenville, Henry Fox, Bedford, and Grafton, dissentient Whigs such as Lord Chesterfield, and Tories like Lord Gower and Sir John Hind Cotton. A victory had been gained over the king, opposition to the ministry was suppressed, and Pelham and his colleagues continued the war with vigour. But the unrepresentative character of the House of Commons and the Hanoverian sympathies of the king checked any enthusiasm on the part of the country for either Parliament or the Crown. Sir George Dashwood's amendment to the address demanding for the people "the right to be freely and fairly represented in Parliament" was not carried, and the consequent indifference of the English people to domestic politics was exhibited during the Jacobite rebellion. In February, 1746, at the height of this crisis, the ministry most unpatriotically resigned in order to force the king to admit William Pitt to office, and on the failure of Carteret, now Lord Granville, to form a Government, the Pelhams returned to office with Pitt as Vice-Treasurer of Ireland,<sup>1</sup> and Henry Fox as Secretary for War. The suppression of the Jacobite movement (p. 486) was followed by the disarmament of the Highlanders, the abolition of the jurisdiction of the Highland chiefs, and the prohibition of the national dress. On the conclusion of the Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle Pelham carried out a number of useful reforms. He took advantage of the prosperity of the country and reduced the rate of interest on the National Debt from four to three per cent. In 1752, on the motion of Lord Chesterfield, the calendar was reformed (p. 477), and the following year Lord Hardwicke's Marriage Act (p. 478), a measure for the prevention of clandestine marriages, was passed, and also an Act for the naturalisation of the Jews, which, however, owing to the popular outcry, was repealed the following session.

The Broad-  
Bottom  
Adminis-  
tration.

New-  
castle's  
Ministry.

In 1754 the death of Henry Pelham put an end to the period of tranquillity in party life which his conciliatory policy had brought about, and George II.'s prediction that he would have no more peace proved absolutely true. The Duke of Newcastle, Pelham's elder brother, became head of the ministry. Though personally honest, and unequalled in

<sup>1</sup> Pitt shortly afterwards became Paymaster-General of the Forces.

# A PROSPECT OF THE NEW JERUSALEM



Who Friends here in Britain your hosts  
 One Thousand seven hundred Fifty Three,  
 Have sent us from the Emerald Isle,  
 To bid this land free and true for Englishmen

The Devil, Infidel, Heretic and Turk;  
 That with the English, fight are Eight weeks,  
 Now both Part is being in the Protestant,  
 Pray Heaven guard our glorious English Defender!

Number XXXII - Let this land be given back, thy servants for a Polytheism

and the other side of the world from 1753 repeating Dec 11, 1753

1753

The Devon-  
shire-Pitt  
Adminis-  
tration.

experience of business and parliamentary management, he made a serious mistake in appointing Sir Thomas Robinson, a dull man, leader of the House of Commons, where he became the object of attacks by Pitt and Henry Fox. In 1755 Fox took Robinson's place and became Secretary of State, and in the autumn Pitt and Legge, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, were dismissed for opposing the Russian and Hessian subsidies. The loss of Minorca in May, 1756, roused the popular anger, and Newcastle resigned in November, being succeeded by the Duke of Devonshire, with Pitt as First Secretary of State and virtual Prime Minister. Pitt at once adopted the measures which the situation of affairs demanded. Highland regiments were formed, a bill for increasing the Militia was passed, and reinforcements were sent to America. He was unable to save Byng, and after three months of office the ministry fell. For eleven weeks the country was without a Government. At length the king and Pitt agreed to a compromise and the Newcastle-Pitt ministry was formed, with Fox as Paymaster-General. The success of the English during the Seven Years' War (pp. 248, 262) was due in great measure to the national enthusiasm stimulated by confidence in William Pitt, whose tenure of office marks an epoch in English history.

The  
Reign of  
George III.

With the accession of George III. in October, 1760, followed by the fall of Pitt and the rise of Bute, began a series of vindictive attacks on the Whigs and a definite attempt on the part of the king to recover for the royal power many of the prerogatives which the Crown had enjoyed previous to the Revolution of 1688. From 1760 to 1770 the king asserted his right to choose his own ministers and his intention of breaking up the Whig domination. During these ten years the struggle continued, ending in the accession of Lord North to office and the triumph of George. The reasons of his success are not hard to find. Since 1688 the Whigs had virtually ruled England; and owing to the fact that the first two Georges were foreigners, Prime Ministers found themselves practically supreme. George III., who prided himself on being an Englishman, determined to resume the power which his predecessors had abdicated to Walpole and his successors. He came to the throne at a time when the people had begun

to feel that the House of Commons did not represent them. The Tories, practically excluded since the accession of George I. from the government of the country, could no longer be accused of Jacobite leanings, and now rallied round the



LORD NORTH.

*(By permission of the Right Hon. Lord North.)*

throne; while the king, taking advantage of the popular dislike of the Whigs, laid out enormous sums in parliamentary and electoral corruption, and

“in maintaining in Parliament a body of men whose political attachment centered in the king alone, who looked to him alone for promotion, who, though often holding places in the Government, were expected rather

to control than to support it, and if it diverged from the policy which was personally acceptable to the king to combine against it and overthrow it." <sup>1</sup>

Attack on  
Cabinet  
Govern-  
ment.

Thus supported by a compact body of "the king's friends," by the Tories, and by popular opinion, George III. began his attempt to break down the system of exclusion, to restore the royal authority, to destroy the principle, which was as yet only partially recognised, that the Cabinet should consist of a body of statesmen who were in thorough political agreement and were jointly responsible for all the measures they proposed, and to substitute in its place what is known as the "departmental system," in accordance with which each minister was responsible for his own department and answerable to the king for his actions. The great Whig party had, even during Walpole's period of office, tended to fall into sections. At the time of the accession of George III. the official Whigs were led by Newcastle, and on his resignation by Rockingham; while from this main body of Whigs the Bedford connection and the Grenville connection stood aloof, and before long Pitt gathered round him a body of followers who opposed corruption on the one hand and aristocratic exclusion on the other.

The King  
and the  
Whigs.  
1760-1770.

George III.'s first attempt to establish his own independence was not successful. Bute's short ministry distinguished itself for corruption and incapacity, and came to a sudden end on April 8th, 1763. Bute was succeeded by George Grenville, who made few changes in the Government. Grenville's ministry is celebrated for two blunders, the attack on Wilkes and the attempt to tax the American colonies. In 1763 John Wilkes, editor of the *North Briton*, was with forty-nine other persons arrested under a general warrant signed by Lord Halifax, Secretary of State, for attacking in No. 45 the king's speech. The mistaken action of the Government resulted in the complete triumph of Wilkes. His arrest as a member of Parliament was declared illegal, general warrants were decided to be contrary to the law, as were "warrants to search for, seize, and carry away papers." After his release Wilkes prosecuted Lord Halifax and Mr. Wood, Under-Secretary of State, and obtained heavy damages

Wilkes.

<sup>1</sup> Lecky, "History of England in the Eighteenth Century," vol. iii., p. 21.

Both Houses of Parliament, however, continued the crusade against Wilkes. The Commons before the end of 1763 voted No. 45 "a false, scandalous, and seditious libel," while the House of Lords voted a certain "Essay on Woman," printed by Wilkes, "a scandalous, obscene and impious libel." In the meantime

### THE BOOT & THE BLOCK-HEAD.



BUTE AND HIS ADMIRERS.

(From a Contemporary Satirical Print.)

Wilkes, after recovering from the effects of a duel, went over to Paris, and in his absence the House of Commons, on January 19th, 1764, expelled him for having written "a scandalous and seditious libel," while on February 21st he was found guilty at the Court of King's Bench for reprinting No. 45 and for publishing the "Essay on Woman"; and as he did not appear for sentence was outlawed. Popular indignation

The  
Stamp Act.

Rocking-  
ham's  
Ministry.

against the Court and ministers by this time ran high, and the Common Council of London thanked their member for asserting the liberties of the country in the matter of general warrants. Wilkes was supported by Newcastle, Rockingham, and Shelburne in the Lords, and by Pitt and Barré in the Commons. Grenville's next blunder in introducing the Stamp Act—an attempt to levy an internal tax on the American colonies, and an infringement of the principle that no people should be taxed except by themselves or through their representatives—led to more serious consequences. But before he could see the effects of his policy the ministry had come to an end. Though in September, 1763, it had been joined by Bedford and his section, the ministry had never been strong, and George's dislike to it was increased by Bedford's management of the Regency Bill and by Grenville's obstinacy and want of tact. After Pitt's refusal to take office, the king was forced to have recourse to the main body of the Whigs, who under Rockingham returned to office in July, 1765. Rockingham attempted to undo the mischief caused by Grenville's action with regard to Wilkes and the American colonies and repealed the Stamp Act, passing in its place a Declaratory Act, which merely stated the right of the English Government to tax America, and so averted for the time the struggle with the colonists. On July 7th, 1766, Rockingham fell, and was succeeded by the Duke of Grafton and Pitt. In spite of the admirable measures passed by the Rockingham ministry, such as the condemnation of general warrants, the repeal of the Stamp Act (p. 444), a commercial treaty with Russia, and a modification in the unpopular cider tax, the king had little difficulty in overthrowing it. Its fall was mainly due to Pitt's refusal to support Rockingham. Pitt was hostile to government by party, he was not in agreement with the Declaratory Act, he disliked Burke's free trade views, he thought the Rockingham Whigs exclusive and aristocratic. His refusal to join the Rockingham Government has been described as "the most disastrous incident in his career."<sup>1</sup> It was only by the union of Pitt and his followers with the Rockingham Whigs that a strong Government could be formed.


<sup>1</sup> Lecky, Vol. III., p. 98.



John Wilkes, by W. Hogarth.



William Hogarth.



Daniel in the Lions' Den.

SATIRES ON THE WILKES CONTROVERSY, 1763.

(From contemporary satirical prints.)



The  
Grafton  
Ministry.

The incoherent Government known as the Grafton ministry included Pitt, Townshend, North, Shelburne, Barré, Conway, Camden, and was a mixture of the followers of Rockingham and Pitt and of the "king's friends." At first it adopted a progressive attitude. Unfortunately Pitt, who on becoming Lord Chatham had lost his influence in the country, soon fell ill and resigned, leaving the Grafton ministry for four years to attempt with little success to grapple with its difficulties. Gradually most of the followers of Rockingham retired, and were replaced by the Bedford Whigs, who supported the king in his views about Wilkes and American taxation.

Wilkes  
and the  
Commons,  
1768-1769.

At the general election of 1768 Wilkes was returned for Middlesex, and the same year he surrendered to the Court of King's Bench, and was imprisoned for twenty-two months and fined. During a disturbance near the prison the soldiers fired on the mob, and in consequence Wilkes wrote a fierce attack on Lord Weymouth, the Secretary of State. On February 3rd, 1769, he was expelled from Parliament on account of his "Essay on Woman," No. 45, and his letter on Lord Weymouth. On February 16th he was re-elected, and the next day the Commons resolved that "he was incapable for sitting in the present Parliament." Finally, after his fourth re-election, the Commons declared that Colonel Luttrell "ought to have been elected," and gave him the seat. Meanwhile Charles Townshend, Chancellor of the Exchequer, had in 1767 passed an Act for taxing American imports by various small customs duties, and had caused profound irritation in America.

Lord  
North's  
Ministry:  
Triumph  
of the  
King.

On Townshend's death, and the secession of Shelburne, Chatham, and Grenville, the Government fell to pieces, and George III., taking advantage of the prevailing disunion among parties, placed Lord North at the head of affairs. Though the influence of the Middlesex election was far-reaching—resulting in the birth of English Radicalism, in attempts to reform Parliament, in the beginning of popular meetings to discuss grievances, and in the establishment of small political societies, such as the Society of the Supporters of the Bill of Rights—the period of Lord North's tenure of office from 1770-82 saw no great constitutional changes. The attention of the nation was at first fixed upon the American quarrel, and after 1778 upon the war against France, Spain, and Holland.

Still, though North's Ministry marks the triumph of the king and the temporary establishment of the system of departmental government, symptoms were not wanting

*What may be doing Abroad.*



*What is doing at Home.*

AT HOME AND ABROAD.

(*The Political Register*, 1769.)

during his twelve years of office of a desire on the part of the people for Parliamentary and other reforms.

In 1771 Parliamentary reporting was recognised, owing to the firm attitude taken by the Lord Mayor of London and Wilkes in opposition to the House of Commons. In 1774

**The Royal  
Marriage  
Act.**

the king unfortunately persuaded North to pass the Royal Marriage Act, giving the reigning sovereign the power of vetoing any marriages made by members of the royal family. In 1778 Sir George Saville carried a measure for the repeal of many of the Catholic disabilities, and in consequence, in 1780, the Gordon riots broke out, which were only suppressed by the firmness of George III. himself. Till

**The Gor-  
don Riots.**



LORD GEORGE GORDON AND THE PROTESTANT PETITION.

(From a Print of 1780.)

1780, owing to the factious character of the Opposition, North's position was overwhelmingly strong; but with the disasters which marked the later phases of the American contest the Chatham and Rockingham Whigs (the former, since Chatham's death, under the leadership of Shelburne) united, and public opinion showed itself in 1780 in the great Yorkshire petition for economical reform, in Burke's Bill to further the same object, in Dunning's motion "that the power

of the Crown has increased, is increasing, and ought to be diminished," and in the Duke of Richmond's Reform Bill advocating annual Parliaments, manhood suffrage, and electoral districts. Chatham had, in 1770, suggested that a third



*Photo: Walser & Co. New York.*

WILLIAM PITT, FIRST EARL OF CHATHAM, BY RICHARD BROMPTON.

*(National Portrait Gallery.)*

member should be given to each county, and in 1776 Wilkes had proposed to disfranchise the rotten boroughs and to give their members to counties and populous towns. In March, 1782, shortly after the arrival of the news of the capture of Minorca, North resigned, and Rockingham formed his second

Rocking-  
ham's  
Second  
Ministry.

ministry, composed of his own followers and the Chatham and Shelburne Whigs. Shelburne and Fox were Secretaries of State, Thurlow Lord Chancellor, and Burke was Paymaster of the Forces. Economical reforms were at once carried out, Government contractors were excluded from the House of Commons, and revenue officers were debarred from voting at elections. To Ireland legislative independence was given (p. 494), but before any further measures could be carried Rockingham died, in July, 1782.

Coalition  
of Fox and  
North.

The two divisions of the Whigs, headed by Shelburne and Fox respectively, being unable to agree, George III. at once appointed Shelburne Prime Minister, who on the retirement of Fox, Burke, and Cavendish, reorganised the Government, making the young William Pitt Chancellor of the Exchequer. After a few months, during which the Peace of Versailles was signed, Fox and North joined forces, overthrew Shelburne, and on April 2nd, 1783, formed the famous Coalition Ministry, with the Duke of Portland as Prime Minister, and Fox and North as Secretaries of State. The coalition was very unpopular in the country, and the king took advantage of the feeling excited against Fox's India Bill to bring his personal influence to procure the rejection of the measure by the House of Lords. On December 18th the Ministers were dismissed, and Pitt, at the age of twenty-four, was made Prime Minister. After an exciting Parliamentary battle, which lasted till March, 1784, public opinion declared so strongly against the conduct of Fox and his party that Pitt dissolved Parliament on March 25th, and at the general election the Whigs were hopelessly routed, and Pitt was returned to power with an overwhelming majority.

Pitt Prime  
Minister.

The King's  
Victory.

George III. had, as in 1770, won a great and apparently a decisive triumph. In 1782 the Whigs had ousted Lord North and the Tories from office, and seemed likely to hold the reins of power for a prolonged period. But the death of Rockingham, followed by the renewal of divisions and jealousies in the Whig party, had led Fox to commit the tactical blunder of making a coalition with North. His error proved fatal to the fortunes of the Whig party, which, if the short Ministry of All the Talents be excepted, remained in the shade of opposition till the time of the Reform Bill. George III.

had again secured the appointment of the Prime Minister, and Pitt remained in office till 1801.

With the fall of Walpole English foreign policy entered definitely upon a new and important phase. With the opening of the War of the Austrian Succession it became impossible for England, with enormous interests in America, India, and Europe, to stand aside and see her ally Austria despoiled by an immoral coalition. From 1740 to 1748, while England aided Maria Theresa in Europe she contended with France and Spain on the sea and in the colonies. From 1756 to 1763, in alliance with Frederick the Great, she gave valuable assistance to Prussia, while she continued and practically concluded her duel with France in America and India. After the conclusion of the Peace of Paris in 1763, she remained isolated in Europe till the beginning of the Ministry of the younger Pitt in 1784. During these years France and Spain took ample revenge for their losses in the Seven Years' War by successfully aiding the Americans to secure their independence. During the whole of the period under review the guiding principles of English policy were hostility to the Bourbons, the development of the colonies and commerce, and the preservation of the balance of power in Europe, especially in the Mediterranean and Baltic, while till 1763 the desire to secure the safety of Hanover affected the relations of England with the German Powers.

ARTHUR  
HASSALL.  
England's  
Foreign  
Policy.

England's foreign policy after the fall of Walpole gained in vigour and definiteness. The new Ministry under Wilmington found itself at war with Spain and involved in a struggle between Prussia and Austria for the possession of Silesia, which was rapidly leading to the outbreak of open hostilities with France in India, in America, and on the sea. The question of maritime supremacy, together with the further questions of the establishment of the English or French influence in India and the supremacy of the Teutonic or Latin race in North America, awaited decision. Though Wilmington was nominally Prime Minister, Carteret directed the foreign policy of the Government. He had a considerable knowledge of Continental affairs, and had shown no little skill as English

Carteret's  
Policy.

Envoy at Stockholm during Stanhope's Ministry. Like Walpole, he saw clearly that Maria Theresa's true policy was to acquiesce in the loss of Silesia: but, unlike Walpole, he proposed to throw England energetically into the European war, and to combat the Bourbons in Germany, in the Netherlands, and in Italy. To the overthrow of the Bourbons all efforts were to be directed and all minor questions were to be subordinated. Hence Carteret and George II. attempted, though in vain, to persuade Maria Theresa to recognise Charles Albert of Bavaria as Emperor, to accept the loss of Silesia, to make peace with Prussia, and to concentrate all her efforts upon an attack on France. The Grand Alliance of 1701 was to be revived, and the work of the Whigs, interrupted—and in Carteret's opinion seriously impaired—by the Tory peace of Utrecht, was to be completed. Success attended the diplomatic and warlike efforts of the English Ministers. The first Silesian war ended with the Treaties of Breslau and Berlin in 1742, by which Maria Theresa unwillingly agreed to the loss of Silesia; the English fleet was successful in the Mediterranean, and a combined army of English, Hessians, and Hanoverians, known as the "Pragmatic Army," and under the command of George II., won the battle of Dettingen (p. 253) on June 27th, 1743.

The  
Treaty of  
Worms,  
1743.

An attempt was now made to open negotiations with a view to a general peace. Prussia had gained Silesia, Maria Theresa's position was assured, the French had been driven back. But as long as Austrian troops occupied Bavaria, and the Emperor Charles VII. was a fugitive, it was impossible to carry out any peaceful arrangements. A scheme known as the Agreement of Hanau, devised by George II. and Carteret to meet this difficulty, ended in failure, and in place of the proposed agreement the Treaty of Worms between England, Holland, Austria, Saxony, and Sardinia was signed in September, 1743, the contracting Powers undertaking to assure the European balance of power and the Pragmatic Sanction. This treaty was met by the Treaty of Fontainebleau between France and Spain, a secret treaty in which Louis XV. and Philip V. agreed to restore Bavaria to the Emperor, to capture Gibraltar, Minorca, and Georgia from England, to annul the Assiento Contract (p. 16), and to hand over

1784]

Parma, Piacenza, and Milan to Don Philip, the second son of Elizabeth Farnese. In March, 1744, France declared war against England, and in April against Austria. In September Frederick the Great, alarmed for the safety of Silesia and suspicious of the Austrian schemes with regard to Bavaria, invaded Bohemia and began the second Silesian War; in November Henry Pelham, who had succeeded Wilmington on the latter's death in July, 1743, secured the dismissal of Carteret, whose independence and arrogance had alienated his fellow Ministers. The difficulties of the English Government had vastly increased with the expansion of the war. Open hostilities with France were now waged by sea and by land, and though in June, 1744, Cape Breton Island was won, and in September Maria Theresa's husband was elected Emperor, the English were defeated in May at Fontenoy, and in July the Pretender Charles Edward landed in Scotland, and the insurrectionary standard was raised (p. 256). His victory of Prestonpans on September 21st, followed by his march into England as far as Derby, threw London into a panic. His retirement was a great relief to the Government; and though Charles won the battle of Falkirk on January 17th, 1746, he was finally overthrown by the Duke of Cumberland at Culloden on April 16th, and escaped to France. The attempts of the French Government to invade England had ended in failure; but Marshal Saxe proved invincible in Flanders, and the battle of Raucoux, in November, 1746, practically laid the whole of the Austrian Netherlands at his feet. In April, 1747, France declared war against Holland, and the Duke of Cumberland, while endeavouring to prevent an invasion of the United Provinces, was in July defeated by Marshal Saxe at Laufeld. Bergen-op-Zoom fell, and Maestricht was besieged. All the combatants were now exhausted. Though a Russian army was marching across Germany to the aid of the allies, the Pelhams, alarmed at the prospect of the immediate fall of Maestricht, hastened on the peace negotiations. On April 30th, 1748, the preliminaries were signed by France, England, and Holland. England and France agreed to a mutual restoration of all conquests, and Spain consented to restore the Assiento Treaty, Prussia obtained Silesia, and Sardinia a portion of the Milanese, while

The Peace  
of Aix-la-  
Chapelle.



Don Philip secured Parma, Piacenza, and Guastalla. Though Maria Theresa had suffered some territorial losses, the Pragmatic Sanction was recognised, and England had the satisfaction of seeing her ally Austria in a strong position. With her maritime supremacy secured, England could look forward without apprehension to the renewal of the struggle with France. After the conclusion of the war the questions at issue between England and France in America and India



SATIRE ON THE TREATY OF AIX-LA-CHAPELLE.

(From a contemporary pamphlet.)

remained unsettled, and the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle was merely a truce. The years between 1748 and 1756 form a period of unrest leading to the Seven Years' War. Nominally England was connected with Austria, Russia, and Saxony, and opposed to France, Spain, and Prussia.

The English Government, however, while anxious to preserve the balance of power in the Baltic and to remain on good terms with Russia, refused to acquiesce in the aggressive schemes of the Tsarina Elizabeth and Maria Theresa against

1784]

the Prussian king. With Austria England's relations became every year less friendly. Walpole's peace policy during the Polish Succession War and his opposition to the Ostend East India Company had shaken the friendship of Charles VI. with England; while the policy of Carteret and his successors in recommending Maria Theresa to acquiesce in the cession of Silesia, of portions of the Milanese, and of Parma, to Frederick the Great, Charles Emmanuel, and Don Philip respectively, had roused the bitterest resentment of the Empress-Queen. The Court of Vienna chafed under the terms of the Barrier Treaty; it was determined to regain Silesia. Under the

The Wheel-Borrow Crvs. of Europe, in 1748-9



EUROPEAN AIMS IN 1748-9.

(From a contemporary satirical print.)

advice of Kaunitz negotiations were opened with France which, as soon as the Convention of Westminster, concluded in January 1756, between England and Prussia, was known, led to the First Treaty of Versailles in May, followed by the Second Treaty a year later. A war between England and France over their American possessions being inevitable, George II. had become very anxious about the safety of Hanover, while Prussia desired protection against Russia and Austria. Hence the two Powers had agreed by the Convention of Westminster to guarantee the neutrality of Germany. Though England and Russia remained at peace, the old alliance between England and Austria came to an end; and, while

The  
Treaties of  
Versailles,  
1756-57.

Russia, Austria, France, and Saxony prepared to attack Prussia, England and France began the final struggle for supremacy in India and America. When Frederick the Great opened the Seven Years' War in August, 1756, by the invasion of Saxony, disasters overtook the English fleets in the Mediterranean, and Minorca was lost. It was not till July, 1757, that the great Pitt-Newcastle Administration gave to England one of the strongest and most successful Ministries of the century.

Pitt and  
the Seven  
Years' War.

By maintaining and increasing the subsidies to Frederick the Great, Pitt kept the French employed on the Continent, while his admirals and generals gained the New World and destroyed all hopes of French supremacy in India. The Convention of Klosterseven, made on September 10th, 1757, by the Duke of Cumberland with the French, was repudiated, and after Frederick's signal victory of Rosbach, on November 5th, 1757, Ferdinand of Brunswick, who took charge of the operations in Western Germany, kept the French in check until the end of the war.

The year 1759, the great year of victories, saw the defeat of the French at Minden on the 1st of August, the almost complete destruction of the French fleets at Lagos and Quiberon Bay, and the capture of Guadaloupe, Ticonderoga, Fort Niagara, Quebec (p. 265), followed the ensuing year by the fall of Montreal. Choiseul, the French Minister, thereupon opened negotiations, which led to no results, and the war continued.

The death of Ferdinand VI. of Spain in 1759, followed by that of George II. in the following year, brought about important changes in the policy of France and England. The new King of Spain, Charles III., made, in August, 1761, a Family Compact with France, engaging to declare war against England if peace was not concluded before May, 1762. Pitt, suspecting the existence of this compact, wished to declare war upon Spain and seize the annual Plate Fleet before its arrival at Cadiz. George III. and Bute, who had succeeded Holderness as Secretary of State for the Northern Department, being eager for peace, opposed Pitt, who thereupon resigned in October, 1761.

In 1762 Bute became First Lord of the Treasury, and found





1784]

himself compelled to continue Pitt's foreign policy. War with Spain was declared in January, 1762, and proved consistently successful. Bute, however, was bent on peace at almost any price, and in November, 1762, the preliminaries were signed. England kept Canada, Tobago, Dominica, St. Vincent, Grenada, Senegal, Gorée, and Minorca. France, having recovered Martinique, Guadaloupe, St. Lucia, and Belleisle, kept the rights of fishing round Newfoundland, with the two small islands of St. Pierre and Miquelon. Spain ceded to England Florida and all her possessions to south and south-east of the Mississippi, receiving from France Louisiana. England's right to cut down mahogany in Honduras was also recognised. In India the French, though recovering their factories, were to have no military establishments. The Peace of Paris was very unpopular in the country, and there is no doubt that, though the gains of England were great, Bute in his haste to conclude peace throw away many advantages. He had alienated our ally Frederick the Great by suddenly suspending the annual subsidies, and by negotiations with the Court of Vienna. Moreover, the Prussian king remained till his death convinced that Bute had attempted to persuade the Tsar, Peter III., to attack him.

The  
Peace of  
Paris,  
1762-3.

In February, 1763, the Peace of Paris and the Peace of Hubertsburg between Prussia and Austria were signed, and the Seven Years' War came to an end. By her subsidies to Frederick and by attacks on the French colonies, her sea coasts, and her commerce, England, while largely contributing to the safety of Prussia, had established her own maritime supremacy.

From 1763 to 1784 England felt the effects (1) of the foreign policy of Bute and (2) of the conquest of Canada. During these twenty-one years, her Ministers being occupied with political dissensions and disputes with America, she was to a great extent isolated in Europe, while the American colonists, freed from the constant fear of French aggression, prepared to assert their independence of the mother country. No sooner was peace concluded than Choiseul and Grimaldi, the French and Spanish Ministers, took energetic steps to reorganise the naval and military services of their respective countries. Prussia remained steadily hostile to England during the remainder of Frederick the Great's life; while Portugal, under the influence

England's  
Foreign  
Relations,  
1763-1784.

of Pombal, a friend of Choiseul, and Holland, jealous of England's commercial supremacy, were inclined to support the French Court in its hostile attitude to Great Britain.

England  
and  
Russia.


With Russia England remained on friendly terms. English admirals and officers aided the Russian fleet during the Turkish war which began in 1768, and the decisive victory of Tchesmé was due to the skill of an Englishman. The friendship of Russia and England, Chatham declared, was a corner-stone in our Continental policy, and during his short period of office in the Grafton Ministry, from 1766 to 1770, he attempted to bring about a close alliance between England, Prussia, and Russia against the House of Bourbon, which he and many of his contemporaries regarded with feelings of the deepest hostility. Though Frederick the Great, now closely allied with Catherine II. by the secret treaty of 1764, refused to enter into any alliance with England, Englishmen continued to aid the Russians in the Turkish war till Catherine's successes alarmed the English Government, and all British subjects were withdrawn from the Russian service. In 1772 and 1773, though England took no steps to hinder the partition of Poland, she refused to support Catherine II. in any interference with the domestic affairs of Sweden. Gustavus III. had carried out a successful revolution on August 19th, 1772, and the English Government, determined to preserve the balance of power in the Baltic, not only persisted in its policy of non-intervention, but prevented the entrance of a French squadron into that sea.

The  
American  
Revolution.

The outbreak of the American War gave France and Russia their revenge. In 1778 the French recognised the independence of the colonists, and war broke out between France and England. In 1779 and 1780 Spain (p. 274) and Holland followed the example of France, and England realised her isolation in Europe. In her extremity she attempted to make an alliance with Russia, and asked Catherine for the aid of 20,000 troops to restrain "the increasing frenzy of his Majesty's unhappy and deluded people on the other side of the Atlantic." But Catherine, influenced by Panin, the supporter of the Prussian alliance, refused the English demand, and did not hesitate to form the Armed Neutrality of 1780, which included, besides Russia, France, Spain, Prussia, Holland, Sweden, and

Denmark. All chance of assistance from Russia was lost, though Catherine herself showed no intention of engaging in a war on behalf of the principles which she had adopted. Deplorable as the condition of England was at the close of the year 1780 and during part of 1781, the English Government, strengthened by the popular feeling against the French, Spaniards, and Dutch, never ceased its efforts.

Though French and Spanish fleets, for a second time during



THE SACK OF ST. EUSTATIUS BY RODNEY AND VAUGHAN.

(From an Anglophobe Dutch work.)

the war, remained in 1781 for some weeks supreme in the English Channel, Gibraltar remained unconquered, while the Dutch lost not only St. Eustatius and the colonies of Demerara and Essequibo, and many of their Eastern settlements, but a large number of merchantmen and some ships of war. Determined, if possible, to secure the aid of Russia, the English Government, in 1781, offered to Catherine the island of Minorca as a price of her alliance.<sup>1</sup> Fortunately, the Tsarina did not appreciate the value to Russia of an island in the western basin

<sup>1</sup> "Diaries and Correspondence of the Earl of Malmesbury," vol. i., p. 373.



The  
Peace  
Treaties of  
1782-83.

of the Mediterranean, and the proposal of England was declined. The surrender of Yorktown on October 19th, 1781, was followed by the recognition of the independence of America by Holland, and by the opening of peace negotiations. In the latter part of 1782 provisional articles of peace between England and the United States were signed; on January 20th, 1782, those with France and Spain. The independence of America was recognised by England, while to France were restored St. Lucia, Tobago, Senegal, Gorée, Pondicherry, Carical, the port of Mahé, and the former French establishments in Orissa and Bengal, and to Spain Minorca and East Florida. England, however, recovered Dominica, Grenada, St. Vincent, St. Christopher, Nevis and Montserrat, Fort James and the River Gambia, and her right to cut logwood in Honduras Bay was again recognised. The Treaty of Versailles, signed in January, 1783, formally closed the war with America, and the treaties with France and Spain were signed the same day. On his accession to office William Pitt found England exhausted with the late war, still isolated in Europe, and with her prestige in Europe low. It remained for him to restore that prestige, and to prove to the world that England was still worthy of being ranked among the leading European Powers.

G. LE M.  
GRETTON.  
The Army.

DURING the eighteenth century it was a common saying among Continental officers that England possessed an "army of lions, led by asses." Our military history from 1742 to 1783 justifies the sarcasm, for among all the men to whom was intrusted the conduct of our wars, two only—Wolfe and Clive—really distinguished themselves. Most of our other generals were dullards, remembered only in connection with victories won by the hard fighting of their soldiers, and defeats caused by their own stupidity. Yet opportunities for distinction were not lacking. Our wars were almost incessant; and the short intervals of peace were but truces, ill observed both in India and in America.

Early in 1743 the British troops quitted their winter quarters in the Low Countries; a force of 40,000 English and Hanoverians was placed under the command of Lord Stair, and marched to Germany to effect a junction with the Austrians. Stair was out-manœuvred by De Noailles, the French general,


[1784]

and when George II. arrived to take command he found the allies in a sorry plight, without supplies, and hemmed in between a river, the deep and rapid Main, and mountains impassable for troops. De Noailles, with 60,000 men, awaited their surrender, which appeared inevitable. King George instantly retired along the river, but De Noailles hung part of his army across the Main at Dettingen, and there seized a defile through which the retreating troops must pass; his batteries played upon them from the far side of the river; a detachment from his main body followed in their rear. Disaster seemed imminent, when the commander of the French detachment which barred the way at Dettingen recklessly descended from the heights commanding the defile, and advanced into the plain to offer battle to the allies. The engagement opened with a prolonged artillery duel, followed by ineffectual cavalry charges on each side. Then the hostile infantry met, and after a sharp struggle the French were driven back across the Main with the loss of some 7,000 men. To King George the cost of the victory is said to have been about 3,000 killed or wounded.

Wolfe, who at the age of sixteen was already adjutant of his regiment, in a letter to his father throws light on the discipline, or indiscipline, of the troops :—

“ The Major and I (for we had neither Colonel nor Lieutenant-colonel), before the French came near, were employed in begging and ordering the men not to fire at too great a distance, but to keep it till the enemy should come near us; but to little purpose. The whole fired when they thought they could reach them, which was like to have ruined us. We did very little execution with it. As soon as the French saw we presented they all fell down, and when we had fired they got up, and marched close to us in tolerable good order, and gave us a brisk fire, which put us into some disorder, and made us give way a little. . . . However, we soon rallied again, and attacked them with great fury, which gained us a complete victory, and forced the enemy to retire in great haste.”

With the battle of Dettingen ends the interest of the campaign; that of the succeeding year is barren of events; but in 1745 “the cockpit of Europe” once more saw a great pitched battle between the English and the French. The French, 76,000 strong, under the celebrated Marshal Saxe, were laying siege to the fortress of Tournai, key to the Austrian Netherlands. In advancing to relieve its garrison, a mixed force of 53,000 allies,



THE OPERATIONS AT DETTINGEN.

English and Hanoverians, Dutch and Austrians, encountered the French near Fontenoy in a position naturally strong, and greatly strengthened by Saxe's field-works. In the combined attack the Dutch and Austrians were beaten back; but the Duke of Cumberland vowed that the English and Hanoverians, unaided, should retrieve the day. He formed his brigades into one massive column, about 16,000 strong, and moved majestically against the French. At first the valour of the redcoats carried all before them; neither incessant volleys of musketry from Saxe's infantry nor a hail of grape from his flanking batteries could stay their progress. The French footguards broke and

The  
Column :  
Fontenoy



MEDAL CELEBRATING THE BATTLE OF FONTENOY.


fled before them. The French cavalry charged repeatedly, and with such vigour that their horses' breasts met our soldiers' bayonets; but in vain. The British colours were already waving over the French camp, and Saxe had sent to advise his king, Louis XV., to provide for his own safety by flight, when the tide of battle suddenly turned. Saxe brought up guns to play at point-blank range upon his exhausted though victorious foe. He launched against them a forlorn hope, the Maison du Roi, the French Life Guards, and the Irish brigade—gallant men whom the policy of our Government had forced into a foreign service. The French footguards rallied and once more fiercely charged. To meet this fresh attack fresh troops were needed, but Cumberland had no reserve of Englishmen, and our allies made no effort to support him. The men could do no more.

Slowly and sullenly they retreated in good order and fighting hard, but the day was lost; and though all Europe rang with the exploit of the British column, the French gained the solid fruits of the victory. The allies, paralysed by the absence of the English, who were hastily recalled to meet the Stuart rising in Scotland, looked on inactive while the chief fortresses of the Netherlands fell one by one into the hands of Marshal Saxe. Until 1747 England was too busy at home to occupy herself in Continental affairs. Then the old policy was resumed. An English army was sent to Flanders, supported by large contingents of allies, often more eager to receive their subsidies of English gold than to earn them by hard fighting. At the desperate but indecisive battle of Laffeldt, near Maastricht, to so-marked a degree did the brunt of the fighting fall on the English that Louis XV. observed "the English not only paid all, but fought for all!"

The  
"Forty-  
five."

The invasion of the Young Pretender found the English Ministers so agitated, so hysterical, so unprepared for war in their own country, that a French marshal, a prisoner in London, declared that "with 20,000 scullions of the French army he would engage to conquer England." Happily no French landing took place, for the military resources of England were sufficiently taxed in dealing with the Stuart rising. The battle of Prestonpans proved the wisdom of an officer who had said that "our soldiers should accustom themselves to the sight of foreign troops, that they may be less at a loss, and act like men, when anything new or extravagant presents itself, and that a plaid, whiskers, or a ruff cap may not be esteemed by them altogether terrible and invincible." For the third time in history British regular troops fled panic-stricken before a Highland charge: Sir John Cope was routed, and Charles Edward became the master of Scotland. The rebels invaded England, and had reached Derby, when they decided to return to Scotland. There, in January, 1746, took place the indecisive combat of Falkirk, where the rain was so furious that the men's powder and firelocks became damp and unserviceable. In April was fought near Inverness the battle of Culloden, where the hopes of the Stuarts were finally extinguished. Charles Edward attempted to surprise the Duke of Cumberland at dawn, but his night march (one of the most difficult operations in war) was a failure; and the English general

had ample time to make his preparations before the enemy appeared. The artillery commenced to play upon the Highlanders, which "made them very uneasy, and, after firing a quarter of an hour, obliged them to change their situation and move forward some hundred yards to attack our front line of



CULLODEN.

(From a contemporary plan.)

foot, which they did with more fury than prudence, throwing down their firearms and advancing with their drawn swords. They were, however, repulsed, and ran off with the greatest precipitation, and the dragoons, falling in among them, completed the victory with much slaughter." While the fight lasted it was sharp. Out of one battalion of veterans from the Low

Countries, which went into action 350 strong, no less than 120 were killed or wounded.

In 1748 Europe, weary of bloodshed, cried truce, and patched up a general peace at Aix-la-Chapelle, one of the clauses of which provided for a restitution of conquests. In Asia France returned to England the settlement of Madras, wrested by her traders from the East India Company. In America the English garrison evacuated the fortress of Louisbourg, which had been captured in 1745, and the white ensign of France once more floated over the Dunkirk of the North. Between England and France the peace was but a nominal one. The rivalry of the two nations soon broke out on the banks of the Ohio. France had long raised a shadowy and unfounded claim to the whole of the North American continent west of the Alleghany mountains, and sought to confine the subjects of Great Britain to the narrow space between these mountains and the Atlantic.


Irregular  
War with  
France in  
America.

The provincials, as the colonists were termed, ignored the French pretensions, and resolutely traded and prospered among the Indians of the Ohio valley. This the French resented. From Paris, in 1753, came orders to the Governor of Canada to incite the Indians to destroy the British trading stations; but on no account was he to be found out, as the two nations were not at war! As the irregular troops of France and England raced for the possession of an important strategic point on the upper waters of the Ohio, the inevitable collision took place. Our handful of provincials was commanded by Washington, the future President of the United States, then serving his apprenticeship to arms as a major of Virginia Militia. Outnumbered and defeated, his whole force were taken prisoners; and for the moment the French dominated the valley of the Ohio from Fort Duquesne, which they built near the scene of their victory, on the site of the present great city of Pittsburg.

Next year each country prepared to reinforce her colonial troops. Braddock was sent to Virginia with two battalions, De Vaudreil was ordered to Quebec with six battalions, escorted by eighteen French men-of-war. While the French diplomatists were amusing the Court of St. James's with assurances of the entirely pacific nature of the expedition, Louis XV. issued secret orders to the Governor of Canada. He was to attack British territory, to employ Indian warriors against the settlers, but,

to avoid compromising his Government, he was resolutely to maintain that he was acting without orders from home. The English Government were equally unscrupulous. They despatched a squadron to cruise in the Atlantic, with secret orders to capture or sink every French vessel proceeding to North America. The fogs off Newfoundland protected the French: only three of their ships were taken by Boscawen, the British admiral; the rest escaped and reached Quebec in safety. It is hardly to be believed that war was not formally declared between the two countries until more than a year after the perpetration of this outrage.

In the middle of the last century Quebec, the capital of Canada, could only be reached by water, and all the approaches were commanded by the French. To the east the St. Lawrence was blocked by Louisbourg, whose active garrison had built outlying forts in Nova Scotia, on debatable land claimed by both nations. To the west the fortress of Frontenac (now Kingston) alike commanded Lake Ontario, and guaranteed Quebec against an attack



LOUISBOURG, CAPE BRETON, FROM A WATERCOLOUR SKETCH.



down the St. Lawrence. To the south hundreds of miles of pathless forest separated the French from the English settlements, broken only by the chain of lovely lakes and rivers which connect the Hudson and the St. Lawrence. Along this waterway two spots were fortified—Crown Point on Lake George, Ticonderoga on Lake Champlain; and round these clearings perished many Englishmen, not only in the war with France, but in the subsequent unhappy conflicts with our provincial brethren.

**Braddock's  
Disaster.**

The British plans for the American campaign of 1755 were ambitious. Braddock, with a force of regular and provincial troops, was to reduce Fort Duquesne; while colonial leaders with colonial troops were to capture the French forts in Nova Scotia, to threaten Lake Champlain, and occupy Niagara. To follow the varying fortunes of these minor expeditions would take too long; they served but to distract the attention of our enemy from the serious business of the year, the attack on Fort Duquesne. After long delays, caused by the apathy and greed of some of the provincials, Braddock succeeded in collecting the transport for his expedition. In May he started with 2,200 men on his ill-omened march to the Ohio. Two regiments of British infantry should have lent his force solidity; his contingent of sailors should have supplied the handiness too often lacking in the soldier; his provincial troops should have furnished invaluable local knowledge. But Braddock was doomed to failure. Franklin thus describes him: "He had too much self-confidence; too high an opinion of the validity of regular troops; too mean a one of both Americans and Indians." In a word, he was an average specimen of a regimental officer of the period—brave as a lion, but absolutely ignorant of everything beyond the mere forms of his profession, the spirit of which he was utterly unable to comprehend. He insulted his colonial officers; he neglected his friendly Indians; he alienated a band of desperadoes well versed in frontier fighting, who offered him their services as scouts. His march was most arduous—for the greater part through pathless woods. Three hundred axemen were employed in hewing down the trees to make a track twelve feet in width, along which his column, often four miles long, dragged its slow length. After two months of incessant fatigue, the expedition approached Fort Duquesne. When within a few

miles of his destination Braddock took the precautions usual in Europe for troops moving through a forest in an enemy's country. He threw out an advance and rear guard, and protected his column by flanking parties. But he would not trust the provincials in the advance-guard, though many of them had experience of Indian warfare. He kept them in the rear, and sent to the vanguard raw lads from England, who had never seen a Red Indian in their lives. Suddenly part of the garrison of Fort Duquesne, ambushed in the woods, attacked the British troops, and our men began to fall rapidly. Braddock wheeled into line with great precision, and fired volleys into the forest against his invisible assailants, who, hidden by the trees, picked off the red-coats at their leisure. The soldiers, wiser than their chief, attempted to extend into skirmishing order and to take cover behind the trees. Braddock rushed at them and drove them into a mass, to be shot down by the enemy. Washington hurried up from the rear with his Virginia militia, and rapidly extended them; but Braddock, who preferred death to the idea of fighting in Indian fashion, fell upon the provincials with his sword drawn, and beat them into a solid formation, an easy target for the Canadians' bullets. In troops thus handled panic was inevitable. The men huddled together like sheep, fired upon each other in their terror, then broke and fled. Happily, there was little pursuit: the Indians were too busy scalping the dead and wounded to follow up the victory, and without their Indian allies the French could not move. Our losses in this eighteenth-century Isandhlwana are variously estimated; one trustworthy authority places them as high as 139 officers and 914 men killed or wounded. Of our antagonists only sixteen white men fell; the number of Indians hit by our wild fire is unknown.

It has often been asked why the provincials, who infinitely outnumbered the French, did not with one great effort conclude the war. The explanation is that Canada had a highly centralised government; the whole of her population was trained to arms; from France she received liberal supplies of soldiers, of selected officers, and of warlike stores. The British colonies, on the other hand, were a collection of semi-republics, more interested in thwarting their governors than in fighting the French, more excited about a trade squabble with the neighbouring province

than in the expulsion of France from the continent of North America. The generals sent from England were too often of the type of the Earl of Loudon. Of him the New Englanders, who suffered much at his hands, bitterly said that he was like St. George on a tavern sign, "always riding on, but never getting anywhere." Everything he touched he mismanaged. His land operations against Montcalm on Lake Champlain in 1756, and his combined naval and military expedition against Louisbourg in 1757, were equally abortive. In 1759 he was replaced by Abercrombie, as great a nonentity as himself.

In 1756 war was openly declared between France and England. A year later we lost Minorca, and an invasion of Britain appeared imminent. But Pitt's accession to power inaugurated a vigorous policy. To occupy the French at home, ten thousand troops, with sixteen ships of the line and other vessels, were despatched to the Bay of Biscay to operate against the naval station of Rochefort. Much might have been accomplished by this great armament, but delays, divided opinions, friction between the generals, antagonism between the army and the navy, brought the expedition to naught. It was a repetition of the fiasco of Carthage, without the attendant loss of life.

In the course of the summer of 1757 in North America things went badly for England. Our garrison at Fort William Henry, near Lake Champlain, surrendered to Montcalm, the newly arrived French general, who guaranteed that on their march back to the nearest British fort the English should be protected by an escort of French troops against the violence of the Indian allies of the victors. No sooner had our people left the fort than numbers of "braves" swarmed into it and slaughtered the wounded in the hospital before the eyes of the French surgeons, powerless to arrest this carnage. The main body of the prisoners were under the nominal protection of a French guard, who, however, allowed the savages to roam about "plundering and insulting the English, grinning like fiends as they handled, in anticipation of the scalping knife, the long hair of cowering women, of whom there were many in the camp." Next day, as the prisoners were being marched away, escorted by Canadian militia—themselves nearly as savage as their Indian comrades—they were surrounded by large numbers of warriors, who suddenly fell upon the column, tomahawk in

1784]


hand. Unchecked by the Canadians, the savages killed and scalped many of the men, captured many of the women, and hurried back to Montreal with 200 miserable prisoners of both sexes, upon whom nameless horrors were inflicted. Men were burned to death over slow fires: they were cut up and cooked, and their wretched comrades compelled to consume this revolting food: mothers were forced to eat the flesh of their own children. At length the French ransomed the prisoners from their allies, of whom, it would appear, they themselves were not a little afraid. Very soon a large number of these warriors were dead, the victims of their own excesses. When Fort William Henry surrendered, they dug up the bodies in the graveyard, to scalp and eat them; but, as small-pox had been prevalent among the garrison, the Indians paid dearly for their cannibal feast.

In 1758 our operations in America were on a large scale. Abercrombie was in nominal command of the troops assembled near Lake Champlain for the invasion of Canada, but the real leader of the expedition was Lord Howe, his chief of the staff, a brilliant young man, the idol of both regulars and provincials. To qualify himself for forest warfare, he had accompanied the best partisan leaders in their raids against the French; and from the experience thus acquired he introduced many reforms among the English troops. "He made officers and men throw off all useless encumbrances, cut their hair close, wear leggings to protect them from briars, brown the barrels of their muskets, and carry in their knapsacks thirty pounds of meal, which they cooked for themselves; so that, according to an admiring Frenchman, they could live for a month without their supply trains."<sup>1</sup> His death in a skirmish paralysed the feeble Abercrombie; and while he vacillated, Montcalm rapidly entrenched himself at Ticonderoga. His handy troops threw up a strong stockade of logs, strengthened by a formidable abattis of forest trees. Such works, held by resolute men, are almost impregnable by infantry, yet against them Abercrombie blindly rushed. He did not seek to turn the enemy's flank, or to threaten his communications with the St. Lawrence. He did not even bring up his artillery, but he formed his men into "columns of attack," and hurled them against the French. The battle

Ticon-  
deroga.

<sup>1</sup> Parkman, "Montcalm and Wolfe," ii. 90.

lasted six hours. Six times did the regulars and provincials resolutely advance; six times were they held as in a vice by the abattis, while the French marksmen picked them off from the shelter of the stockade. All the men fought well; one Highland regiment left half its strength on the ground; but the efforts of the troops were in vain. The victory was to Montcalm: with 3,600 Frenchmen he repulsed 15,000 Britons, of whom about 2,000 were killed or wounded.



PLAN OF FORT DUQUESNE, 1754.

Louisbourg  
Recovered.

But elsewhere we were successful. Fort Duquesne, on the Ohio, fell into our hands, and was renamed Pittsburg, in honour of the great Minister. A dashing raid on Frontenac (Kingston) destroyed the French naval power on Lake Ontario. Louisbourg, to the intense joy of all Englishmen, was again wrested from the French. Pitt, who after the Rochefort failure had determined to appoint his generals by selection and not by seniority, confided to two young men the conduct of this important siege. Amherst, who had made his name in Germany, was in command. Wolfe, the only

soldier who had won renown in the Rochefort expedition, ranked second to him. Boscawen, the admiral, worked hand in glove with the generals. The sailors and the soldiers shared the dangers of the enterprise, and reaped the laurels of the capture of Louisbourg with 5,600 prisoners. Never in our history was the vital necessity that England should command the sea more aptly illustrated than during this expedition. The French fitted out two great fleets to relieve the garrison, but neither of them succeeded in crossing the ocean. The squadron from Toulon was imprisoned in the Mediterranean by our fleet, which, based upon Gibraltar, denied them the Atlantic. The ships from Rochefort were encountered by part of our Channel squadron, and driven on the rocks close to the harbour from which they had sailed.

The fall of Louisbourg opened the St. Lawrence, and Pitt decided on his operations for next year. Amherst was sent to succeed Abercrombie in command of the troops, who were to force their way to Canada by the valley of Lake Champlain. Wolfe, at the head of a combined naval and military force, was to make England mistress of Quebec, the virgin fortress of the North. Twice before had an English armament attempted to reduce the city. In 1690 the gallant men of Massachusetts, after conquering Nova Scotia, sailed up to Quebec, but were beaten back. Twenty-one years later a force of many British ships and nine battalions of infantry was miserably wrecked on the shoals of the St. Lawrence.

It was late in June, 1759, before Wolfe had reached Quebec; and even his gallant heart must have sunk as he realised the difficulties of the task before him. Built on a high grey rock, Quebec, like an inland Gibraltar, rises sheer out of the vast basin formed by the junction of two mighty rivers at its feet. From the south-west the St. Lawrence, at this point little more than a mile wide, rolls past the city. To the north-west the St. Charles served as a great "wet-ditch" in front of the fortifications of Quebec. Steep cliffs rise from the river to the plateau behind the town, and these for several miles were watched by a strong detachment under Bougainville. To attack Quebec from the St. Lawrence appeared impossible; to do so from the St. Charles seemed equally hopeless.

Wolfe at  
Quebec.

Montcalm lay entrenched with 14,000 men along the northern shores of the great basin; his right flank rested on the St. Charles, his left on the falls of the Montmorenci. Until he could be dislodged, Quebec seemed impregnable. To out-manceuvre Montcalm, to drive him away or to compel him to give battle, was Wolfe's object during many weeks. But Montcalm was playing a waiting game. He knew that Amherst was making very slow progress on Lake Champlain, and he intended to keep Wolfe at arm's length till the approach of autumn should compel the English to abandon operations for the year.

Early in September Wolfe decided, as a last expedient, to assail Quebec from the westward. By feigned attacks he distracted Montcalm's attention, while troops were secretly marched along the southern bank of the river to a creek some miles above Quebec. Here our ships, which had driven the French vessels before them, lay in readiness. As soon as the weather permitted, the men were hurried on board, and under the cover of the night the flotilla dropped down the stream on the ebbing tide. At length Wolfe stopped his boat at a spot where his keen eye had a few days previously detected a rough track up the face of the cliff. The vanguard disembarked: silently they scaled the height and drove off a French outpost left to watch this spot. Soon reinforcements came up. By the morning about 4,000 men had crossed the river without serious molestation from the enemy, and had gained the Heights of Abraham, which command Quebec from the rear. Wolfe's position was most critical. With incredible daring he had thrust himself between two hostile armies: behind him were gathering the scattered forces of Bougainville; in front lay Quebec, with 2,000 men crowded behind its fortifications; and through its gates were pouring the troops of Montcalm, whom Wolfe had thus at length compelled to fight. The odds were heavily against us, but the battle did not last long. The steady volleys of the British demoralised the enemy, the vigour of their bayonet charges overthrew them. In the moment of victory Wolfe, pierced by three bullets, fell mortally wounded. As he lay dying on the ground one of the men with him exclaimed, "They run, they run!" "Who run?" gasped Wolfe. "The




A DRAWING OF QUEBEC IN 1761, BY R. SHORT.



enemy, sir." Wolfe roused himself to give the order to cut off their retreat; then, turning on his side, he murmured, "Now, God be thanked, I will die in peace."

Almost at the same moment fell Wolfe's worthy antagonist, the valiant Montcalm; and with him died all hopes of a successful French defence. "Never was rout more complete than that of our army," wrote a French official. Quebec surrendered, and ten English battalions, the nucleus of the force which next year completed the conquest of Canada, remained to garrison it.

During the remainder of the war Pitt sent expeditions to



MILITARY CLOAK OF GENERAL WOLFE.

(Tower of London.)

many parts of the world. We took Havana, in the West Indies; Manila, in the Philippine Isles; Belleisle, off the coast of France. But by the Treaty of Paris (p. 249) all three were surrendered. Seven years later hostilities with Spain nearly broke out again over the Falkland Islands. Attention had been drawn to their value in case of a war with Spain by the narrative of Anson's voyage, and a British expedition to them had been planned in 1748, but countermanded on the protest of the Spanish Ambassador. In 1765 they were taken possession of, on behalf of the Crown, by Captain Byron (p. 296), the British claim being based on the alleged prior discovery of them by Davis in 1592 and by Hawkins in 1594. In

The  
Falkland  
Islands.

1784]

1766 a small garrison was placed there, which was ordered off by the Spaniards in 1769, and forcibly expelled by a Spanish fleet in June, 1770. A British squadron was hastily equipped (p. 284), but after much negotiation the Spanish Government gave way and consented to restore the garrison.



*The Recruiting Sergeant.*

(From the "Oxford Magazine" of 1770.)

The dispute, however, naturally intensified Spanish feeling against England, and helped to prepare for the renewal of hostilities nine years later (pp. 250, 274).

In the American War of Independence, the first blood was shed near Boston in April, 1775. The same restless energy which in happier times had led Massachusetts to

The  
American  
War.

fight in the quarrels of the mother country with France and Spain, now showed itself in active preparations for civil war. The Bostonians raised a large militia, and at Concord, a village about twenty miles from Boston, collected the supplies necessary for their equipment. To destroy the stores, Gage, who commanded the king's troops in Boston, sent a strong detachment. The expedition was to have been a surprise, but someone at headquarters babbled, and the troops only accomplished the object of their march after a skirmish with a body of militia whom they found ready to resist them at Lexington. As soon as the stores were burned they hurried homeward, to find that the whole countryside had turned out against them. Every house, every tree, every fence sheltered a marksman, who strove to pick off the soldiers as they ran this gauntlet of fire. So utterly exhausted were our men by their retreat that they were "obliged to lie down for rest on the ground, their tongues hanging out of their mouths, like dogs after a chase." The sight of British regulars hastily retiring before the Massachusetts militia so elated the New Englanders that in a short time 20,000 men had collected round Boston, waiting an opportunity to harass the royal troops. Their chance soon came. To the north of Boston, separated from it by the River Charles, rises the eminence of Bunker's Hill. Although this height dominated the British camp, Gage disdained to occupy it, until by a daring night march the provincials seized it at midnight and roughly fortified it by dawn. Then indeed he moved; about 2,000 men were hastily thrown across the river, and formed in two lines for the attack. Burdened with three days' provisions, a knapsack, cartouche-box, ammunition, firelock, and bayonet (a weight stated by Stedman, a military historian of the war, to have reached the almost incredible amount of 125 lb.), the troops slowly toiled up the slippery hill under so incessant and so destructive a blaze of musketry that twice they recoiled before it. Then professional spirit reasserted itself: they would not be beaten by militiamen, and, with fierce shouts and levelled bayonets, they stormed the breastwork and drove the provincials down the slope. So deadly was the aim of the colonial riflemen that nearly half the British troops engaged in the attack fell on the field of this Pyrrhic victory.


Bunker's  
Hill.

After Bunker's Hill a spell seemed to fall upon General Gage. Without a struggle he allowed Washington, now in supreme command of the provincial forces, to blockade the English in Boston and to throw up batteries which commanded the town. In March, 1777, the bombardment commenced; and then Gage awoke to the fact that he must either dislodge the Americans from their new works or evacuate the town. To capture these works would have been most difficult, "for the British troops must have ascended an almost perpendicular eminence, on the top of which the Americans had prepared hogsheads chained together in great numbers and filled with stones, to roll down upon them as they marched—a curious provision, by which whole columns would have been swept off at once." Gage therefore determined to abandon Boston to the provincials, and with difficulty embarking his large garrison, reached Halifax, Nova Scotia in safety.

Late in the summer the English resumed operations. An expedition was sent to the neighbourhood of New York, composed of the troops from Halifax and reinforcements from England. Among the latter were large numbers of Hessians, whose cruel exactions embittered the spirit of the provincials against us. Various engagements took place; the trained and disciplined valour of the professional soldiers won victories, the fruits of which were often lost by the supineness of their leaders. Throughout the war the plans of our generals, conceived without intelligence, were executed without energy. Thus Washington, who should have been annihilated at Long Island, was allowed to escape to the mainland after a mere defeat. His exploit affords an interesting illustration of the ineptitude of our troops during the American War. Washington was hemmed into the corner of the island by a British force superior in number to the raw provincial levies whom he commanded. His position was desperate, for his provisions were nearly exhausted, his ammunition was spoilt, his men were disheartened, and at any moment a change of wind might cut off his retreat by placing the British fleet between New York and himself. Secretly he collected a flotilla of boats and cutters, and on board these at dead of night he commenced to embark his troops, 9,000 strong: by dawn he

Washington's  
Escape  
from Long  
Island.

had succeeded in evacuating the island and in reaching the mainland, undetected by the British army. The fact that the American covering-parties heard the sound of digging in our outposts proves that some at least of our soldiers were not asleep on duty, and renders it even more inexplicable that the noise of the embarkation should have been unnoticed by our pickets. "Neither the deep murmur in the camp, nor the plash of oars on the river, nor the ripple under the sailing



THE OPERATIONS ON LONG ISLAND, 1777.

(From the "History of the Civil War in America," 1780.)

boats" attracted the attention of our look-out men, until at four o'clock the alarm was given that the Americans were in full retreat. Even then, according to Bancroft, several hours elapsed before the officers thought it necessary to send into the now empty camp a solitary patrol, to verify this astounding intelligence! Yet, on the whole, the campaign was in our favour. By the winter New York was occupied, Washington was driven into Pennsylvania, and a scheme was prepared for a serious attack upon New England, the heart and brain of the rebellion. From Canada,

General Burgoyne was to make his way, by the Lake Champlain route, to the Hudson; General Clinton was to push up that river from New York; at Albany the forces were to join hands and thus cut off the New Englanders from the rest of the insurgent provinces; while, to distract Washington's attention from the north, Howe was to attack him in Pennsylvania. The summer of 1777 saw the partial execution of this design. Howe sailed to the Chesapeake, landed in Pennsylvania, worsted Washington at Brandywine Creek, and took Philadelphia. Thus the minor operation succeeded; but the real object of the campaign, the attack on New England, resulted in one of the most crushing defeats which the British army have ever experienced — a defeat in which the one redeeming feature is that it was inflicted upon us not by foreigners, but by men of our own race and language.

Burgoyne's expedition was composed of 7,000 infantry, half of whom were Germans, a detachment of artillery, and a corps of Canadian axe-men. In addition to these white men were the braves, warriors of the Indian nations with whom Great Britain had stooped to ally herself. It was less than twenty years since England had learned, by bitter experience on the Canadian and Virginian frontiers, that, in the words of Chatham, "the Red man is a cannibal savage, torturing, murdering, roasting, and eating the mangled victims of his barbarous battles." Yet she did not now hesitate to employ the wielders of the tomahawk and the scalp-ing-knife in her efforts to coerce the New Englanders into subjection.

After a first success upon Lake Champlain in July, nothing went well with Burgoyne. October found him entrenched in the forest near Saratoga, to the west of the River Hudson. His supplies were exhausted, his communications with Canada lost; he was surrounded by a superior force of Americans, deeply enraged at the outrages which his Indians had committed. To retreat was impossible; his only hope lay in a vigorous attack upon the enemy. With 1,500 men he flung himself upon the left flank of the American line. The men fought well, but were hopelessly outnumbered. Gates, the American general, not only thrust Burgoyne reeling back, but, hotly pursuing him to his camp, burst into


**Burgoyne  
Defeat:  
Saratoga**

that portion of it occupied by the Germans, and held it so resolutely that evening still found the provincials in possession. In the night Burgoyne retreated; but he could not go far. Hemmed in on every side by an enemy too wise to accept the battle he constantly offered; with his men starving from hunger and dying from disease; with no trustworthy information of the position of Clinton's co-operating force, Burgoyne had no alternative but to surrender. By the irony of fate, on the very night that the capitulation was signed, a message was received from Clinton to report that his advance-guard had arrived within fifty miles of Saratoga. But the news came too late. The surrender was effected, and 5,700 troops in the service of George III., about 3,000 of whom were Englishmen, laid down their arms to the victorious New Englanders.

The surrender of Saratoga lost to England the colonies of North America. France, ever anxious to pay off old scores against us, saw in our defeat a golden opportunity: she recognised the independence of the United States, and declared war against England on their behalf. Spain, longing for an opportunity to recover Gibraltar, followed the French example. If England had been unable to vanquish her rebellious colonists while her command of the sea was undisputed, how could she now hope to do so while fighting her two hereditary enemies in Europe? The ministry blundered on in America, winning an occasional trick, but always beaten on the rubber. Their plan—if plan there was—seems to have been to keep an army at New York, from which to maintain strong detachments in the Carolinas and in Virginia. In 1781 our harsh conduct in North Carolina had so alienated the inhabitants, that even the Loyalists rejoiced to see Cornwallis retire northwards towards Virginia. There our troops, under the mistaken policy of bleeding the rebellion to death, did enormous damage, estimated at two millions sterling. At first Cornwallis was unopposed, but when the militia arrived to reinforce the United States regular troops he retired towards the coast; and in October he had been driven to the peninsula of Yorktown, at the mouth of the York River, on the coast of Virginia. Here he hastily entrenched himself, hoping against hope that our fleet from New York would rescue him. But England had lost the command of the sea. A strong

# PLAN OF THE POSITION

on the 10.<sup>th</sup> of September 1777.



THE OPERATIONS AT SABATOGA, 1777.  
(Stedman, "History of the American War," 1794.)



French fleet from the West Indies not only brought to the Franco-American army a welcome reinforcement of 3,000 men, but it kept our relieving squadrons at bay; and when at length our naval reinforcements arrived, they came too late. To defend his unfinished works at Yorktown Cornwallis had only 7,000 men. Washington commanded 16,000 troops, of whom 7,000 were French veterans. The English general fought till his guns were dismounted, his shells expended, and then surrendered. One of the terms of the capitulation was that the English troops should march out of Yorktown with bands playing, so a bandmaster selected an air the title of which admirably expressed the feelings of Cornwallis's army—"The World's turned upside down!"

**The Great  
Siege of  
Gibraltar.**

With the surrender of Cornwallis the military interest shifts from the shores of North America to the Straits of Gibraltar. Here Elliott triumphantly maintained his post during the weary years of the great siege. From July, 1779, when the first shot was fired, until the virtual suspension of hostilities in January, 1783, the garrison suffered terribly. Food constantly ran short; whatever provisions were thrown in by the fleet were necessarily salt, so that the troops were consumed by scurvy from the want of fresh meat. The bombardment was steadily maintained, and on one occasion raged without intermission for six weeks. During the spring of 1781 the Franco-Spanish army fired 56,000 shot and 20,000 shells into the town, but without shaking the courage of the troops. Late in that year Elliott made a brilliant sortie. At dead of night he surprised the enemy's guns and destroyed many batteries. So utterly unexpected was the attack, that in one of the casements was found the report of a Spanish officer, written in advance for the morrow. In it he stated that nothing remarkable had occurred during the night! The obstinacy of the defence roused the greatest interest in Europe, and so much exasperated the allied sovereigns that they offered for public competition prizes for the best plans for the capture of the Rock. A scheme for a combined attack by land and sea was adopted, and the French were confident of success. In September, 1782, the supreme effort was made. After several days' preliminary bombardment, the allied fleet of forty-seven ships of the line, numerous frigates, and ten floating batteries anchored within 1,200 yards of the sea face of the Rock.

1784]

Their fire was terrific, and was continued by the batteries erected to attack the Rock from the Spanish territory. To reply to the 500 guns which were in action against them the garrison could only fire 96 pieces, but the red-hot shot with which we unceasingly plied the enemy utterly demoralised them. After eight hours the bombardment began to slacken off; the floating batteries were burned or sunk: the grand attack had failed, and from the summit of the Rock the British flag still waved. A few days later reinforcements arrived, and no further operations of importance took place during the rest of the war.


By the Treaty of Peace in 1783 England acknowledged the independence of the United States (p. 252). She ceded to France St. Lucia and Tobago, some posts in India and on the West Coast of Africa; but in exchange she received several islands in the West Indies. She restored Florida and Minorca to Spain. It was peace, but—except for the Navy and for the garrison of Gibraltar—not peace with honour.

THE multitudinous naval events of a period which witnessed the services of such great men as Hawke, Anson, Boscawen, Hughes, and Rodney, and such distinguished ones as Byron, Pocock, Watson, Byng, Knowles, Balchen, Norris, and Warren, cannot be even catalogued here. It was an age of brilliant successes, but also, like the age of Anne, of some regrettable failures, due in a few instances to incapacity, but in the majority either to personal jealousies or to official red-tapeism. Of the numerous court-martial, the most celebrated are those which resulted from the actions of Vice-Admiral Thomas Mathews off Toulon in 1744 and of Vice-Admiral the Hon. John Byng off Minorca in 1756. Mathews was condemned and broken for having given too liberal an interpretation to the rather hide-bound rules which then regulated the conduct of a naval action; Byng was condemned and shot for having too literally obeyed the regulation; and it cannot now be believed by the unprejudiced student that either Mathews or Byng deserved their severe punishment. A curious episode which occurred during the trial of Vice-Admiral Richard Lestock, Mathews's quarrelsome second in command, who was acquitted, deserves notice, since it is often justly cited as an illustration of the supremacy of civil power even where the

W. LAD  
CLOWE  
The Na

Naval  
Law.

services are concerned. While the court-martial was sitting, its president, Rear-Admiral Perry Mayne, was arrested in virtue of a writ of *capias* issued by the Court of Common Pleas. The members, very indignant, passed severe and disrespectful resolutions directed against Lord Chief Justice Willes, and forwarded them, with a remonstrance, to the Admiralty. The king was ill advised, and directed the Duke of Newcastle to write to the Lords of the Admiralty "that his Majesty expressed great displeasure at the insult offered to the court-martial," etc. ; but the Lord Chief Justice, a lawyer of sound learning and a man of determined will, immediately caused the arrest of every member



FRENCH MEDAL COMMEMORATING THE ENGLISH FAILURE AT  
TOULON, 1743-4.

of the court-martial, and was about to take legal proceedings to maintain the dignity and authority of his office, when the officers submitted and tendered in writing a most humble and yet a most honourable and manly apology.

**Manning  
the Navy.**

It may be interesting, while dealing with the subject of naval *personnel*, to give here some idea of the fluctuations in the number of men annually voted for the service of the Royal Navy from the year of the Revolution to that of the accession of George III. The number in 1689 was only 7,000. Then it gradually increased to 40,000, at which it remained from 1694 to 1697, falling in 1698 to 10,000, rising again in 1699 to 15,000, and once more falling in 1700 to 7,000. In 1701 it rose to 30,000, and in 1702 to 40,000, where it remained till 1712. It was then gradually reduced to 10,000, and after some fluctuations

again fell in 1722 to 7,000. Thenceforward it increased to 20,000 in 1727, and fell to 8,000 in 1732-3, mounting to 20,000 in 1734 and to 30,000 in 1735. Again it fell during the peace, to rise to 35,000 in 1740 and to 40,000 in the years 1741-48. The



REAR-ADMIRAL THE HON. JOHN BYNG, BY THOMAS HUDSON.

*(By permission of the Right Hon. the Rev. the Earl of Strafford.)*

subsequent peace saw the usual reduction, the numbers reaching the minimum of 8,000 in 1751; but the year 1756 saw 50,000 men voted; and this number, great though it was, increased to 70,000 in 1760. Such wide fluctuations naturally, on the one hand, put the Admiralty to great difficulty in finding men, and,

on the other, caused the men immense hardships ; and as a result attempts, unhappily ineffectual, were made in 1739, and again in 1749, to revive the Register Act. But the lot both of officers and men was considerably improved during the period. For example, half-pay was granted to senior surgeons in 1729 ; a corporation for the relief of poor widows of sea officers was established in 1732, the king contributing £10,000 to it ; the Sick and Hurt Office was reorganised in 1740 ; in the same year the impressing of men above fifty or under eighteen, and of all persons in the first years of their sea service, was forbidden ; established rank and uniform were conceded to officers in 1747 ; an attempt to subject half-pay officers to maritime law was defeated in 1749 ; and the Marine Society, for the education of orphan or friendless boys for the Navy, was instituted in 1756.

Scientific  
Navigation.

Some allusion has already been made to the work of the Board of Longitude, and to the time-keeping inventions of Mr. Harrison (p. 28). Further progress in the direction of the discovery of a method for finding the longitude at sea was made soon after the accession of George III. In 1761 the Lords of the Admiralty ordered Captain Dudley Digges, of the *Deptford*, 50, to take on board Mr. Harrison and one of his instruments, and to proceed on an experimental cruise. The ship made first Madeira, and subsequently Jamaica, at the exact times indicated by the chronometer. Harrison returned home in the *Merlin*, and reached Portsmouth after more than four months' absence, to find that his instrument, notwithstanding the very bad weather which had been encountered, had lost only 1 min. 54.5 secs., a result far exceeding anything that had before been attained. Another trial was made in 1764, on board the *Tartar*, Captain John Lindsay. Between March 28th, when she left Spithead, and April 19th, when she reached Madeira, the instrument maintained, as nearly as could be discovered, absolute correctness ; and after a further voyage to Barbados, and return in a merchant vessel, which enabled Mr. Harrison to reach London on July 18th, the gain amounted to only 54 secs. The Board of Longitude took another important step in 1765, when the marine table, invented by Mr. Witchell, for finding the longitude at sea by the lunar method, was considered and approved. A sum of a thousand pounds was advanced in order to enable this inventor

1784]

to carry his plans into execution, and, aided by Mr. Isaac Lyons, jun., Mr. Wales, and Mr. Mapson, Mr. Witchell laid the foundations of the scheme which, thanks mainly to the Rev. Dr. Nevil Maskelyne, then Astronomer Royal, bore fruit in 1767 in the publication of the first number of the *Nautical Almanac*. In proof of the marvellous amount of labour expended upon that complicated and invaluable work, it may be mentioned that in the annual issues of the following half-century only a single error was discovered—even that one being quite unimportant—and that the great astronomer Lalande was able to write of it, “*On en a fait à Bologne, à Vienne, à Berlin, à Milan ; mais le Nautical Almanac de Londres est l'éphéméride la plus parfaite qu'il y ait jamais eu.*” Maskelyne did much else during his long life, but the creation of the *Nautical Almanac* remains his greatest title to fame. He himself conducted it for forty years.

The  
Nautic  
Alman


The earlier part of the reign of George III. is an especially interesting and important period in British naval history, if only because it witnessed the professional training and education of the officers who were destined to bring the British Navy to its highest pitch of glory. The Peace of 1763—a date but seven years previous to that at which Nelson entered the service—seems, in fact, to mark a dividing-line between the older era, when tactics were still crude and conventional, and the newer one, when the genius and initiative of individuals began to have fuller play and to exert greater weight. To Lord Hawke, who in some respects at least must be considered as the best of our naval commanders, belongs the credit of having shown the way to a better order of things. His career overlapped on the one hand the unfortunate days of Byng and of Mathews, and on the other the glorious ones of Nelson, of Collingwood, and of Saumarez. And, as he was First Lord of the Admiralty from 1766 to 1771, and was for years, both before and afterwards, very influential in the naval councils of the nation, his hand may be detected in many of the reforms of what may be called a transition period. Apart from reforms which were merely administrative, there were several material ones which, as having a bearing upon the general welfare of the Navy, deserve attention.

A New  
in the  
Navy.

It was in 1761 that the experiment of coppering a ship's bottom was first tried with a British man-of-war. The vessel

**Improve-  
ments in  
Material.**

was the 32-gun frigate *Alarm*, which had been built at Harwich in 1758. Within five-and-twenty years of that time ships of all classes in the Navy were coppered, for it soon became apparent not only that the process preserved the planking, but also that it very largely improved the sailing qualities. The plates of copper were applied over sheets of thick paper of a peculiar toughness by means of countersunk nails. So efficacious was the coppering in the case of the *Alarm*, that when the frigate was broken up in 1812 her bottom timbers were still remarkably sound, whereas



LIGHTHOUSE CANDLES.

(By permission of the Elder  
Brethren, Trinity House.)


uncoppered ships of her date and build commonly became hopelessly wormed in ten or fifteen years, or even less in hot climates. Lead had been previously tried as a preservative, but not with much success. Another innovation of the period was the introduction to ships of war of the chain-pump as improved and adapted for the service by Mr. William Cole. It was taken up, and its use was advocated, by Captain John Albert Bentinck, R.N., and in 1764 it was fitted experimentally to a 64-gun ship. Experiments were continued at intervals until 1768, when, in the *Seaford*, a frigate moored in Portsmouth Harbour, it was found that, with four men working it, it discharged a ton of water in 43.5 secs., whereas the pump previously in use needed seven men to discharge a ton in 76 secs., while it needed 81 secs. for four men to do the work.

Moreover, the new pump, when choked with shingle ballast, could be cleared in four minutes, whereas the old machine, when similarly choked, could not be cleared at all until the water had been baled or pumped out of the hold. Cole's pump was therefore adopted, and on countless occasions it rendered the most valuable service.

A yet more valuable innovation, although it was not extensively utilised until a much later date, belongs to the present period. This was the fitting to certain ships of apparatus for producing fresh from salt water. In 1761 Dr. Lind discovered that

sea water, distilled without the addition of anything whatsoever, yielded perfectly pure fresh water. An account of this discovery was read to the Royal Society in 1762, and was soon afterwards published by authority of the Admiralty. In 1763 M. Poissonnière, a Frenchman, invented a suitable still for the purpose; and this appears to have been employed in 1773 by Captain the Hon. Constantine John Phipps, of the *Racehorse*

Distilla-  
tion on  
Shipboard.



MODEL OF SMEATON'S EDDYSTONE LIGHTHOUSE.

(By permission of the Elder Brethren, Trinity House.)

during the famous Polar voyage which young Horatio Nelson took part in. But already another distilling apparatus, the invention of Dr. Irving, had been introduced to the Navy in 1770. It was not intended at the time that ships should ever depend exclusively for their fresh water upon such devices, nor in the eighteenth century were stills very common on board ship, yet as early as 1771 a committee of naval officers reported that without difficulty sufficient water for her ordinary purposes might be distilled by any vessel, little more fuel being requisite




than that needed for cooking and the other usual business of the ship.

#### Recruiting.

The popularity of the Naval Service was increased by the granting of not a few concessions and advantages to officers, to men, and to workers in the dockyards. At the time of the Falkland Islands scare (p. 268) in 1770, for example, the Government offered a bounty of 30s. a head to able seamen; and many cities and towns offered additional bounties, London offering 40s., Bristol 20s., Montrose 42s., Edinburgh the same, and Aberdeen and Lynn each 21s. In 1773, again, the Government bounties were, for each able seaman £3, for each ordinary seaman £2, and for each landsman £1. And in 1779 the popular enthusiasm, not content with offering bounties, went further. The fine 74-gun ships *Ganges*, *Carnatic*, and *Bombay Castle*, laid down at that time and launched a few years later, were built at the cost of the East India Company. Encouragement in other directions was not lacking. In 1763, after the peace, the Marine Society made arrangements for putting out as apprentices in the Merchant Service, or otherwise providing for the future of, a large number of boys under sixteen years of age discharged with good characters from the Royal Navy. In the same year it was ordered, in response to a petition, that seamen who had deserted, but who had subsequently re-entered and had served with good character, should have the letter "R," signifying "run," removed from against their names on the pay-books of the Navy. In the year following, as an encouragement to the artificers in the royal dockyards, two per cent. of the men, chosen from those who had served with good character for thirty years, were given pensions of £20 per annum; and in 1771 the percentage was increased to two and a half, and classes for pensions were established; while in 1773, when the king reviewed the fleet at Spithead, his Majesty distributed £1,500 among the artificers, workmen, and labourers of the Dockyard, Victualling Office, and Gun Wharf. In that year also the half-pay of captains was increased by 2s. a day, so that henceforth the half-pay of the thirty seniors stood at 10s., that of the next fifty at 8s., and that of the rest at 6s. At about the same time the number of surgeons entitled to half-pay was increased from 50 to 100, one half to receive 2s. 6d. a day and the other half 2s.; and the number of masters similarly entitled was also raised to 100—

half, as in the other case, being given 2s. 6d. and half 2s. The position of the masters was further improved in 1779, when the twenty-five senior ones, if properly qualified, became eligible for 3s. 6d., and the next seventy-five for 3s., a day. The surgeons received additional advantages in 1781. Nor should the incorporation in 1775 of the Hibernian Marine Society in Dublin be forgotten. The society was established for maintaining, educating, and apprenticing the orphans and children of decayed seamen of the Royal Navy and of the merchant service.



THE HERMIONE.

(After capture in 1762: from an old engraving.)

But, after all, the strongest encouragement to the Navy lay in the fact that whenever there was war there was also prize-money for good officers and men who knew how to obtain it. The foundation of many a fine fortune was built upon prize-money; and it will not be uninteresting to print a statement of the disposal of the booty taken on the occasion of the capture of a single Spanish ship, the *Hermione*, in 1762. Few prizes were, of course, so rich as this, but on numerous occasions the sum for division exceeded £100,000. The *Hermione* was taken off Cadiz by the *Active*, 28, Captain Herbert Sawyer, and the *Favourite*, 16, Commander

Prize-  
Money.


Philemon Pownall, and she made no resistance. The capturing ships belonged to a squadron under Vice-Admiral Sir Charles Saunders and Commodore Sir Piercy Brett, and these lucky officers, therefore, though they were not present, were entitled to share largely; but even after their proportion, amounting to £64,963 3s. 9d., had been deducted, there remained :

To Captain Sawyer of the <i>Active</i> ... ..	£65,053 13 9
To each of the three commissioned officers of the <i>Active</i> ... ..	13,004 14 1
To each of eight warrant officers of the <i>Active</i>	4,336 3 2
To each of the twenty petty officers of the <i>Active</i>	1,806 10 10
To each of the <i>Active's</i> 150 seamen and marines	485 5 4

Thus the entire *Active's* share amounted to £251,020 12s. The *Favourite's* share, she being not entitled to any of the bounty-money, was but £203,181 4s. 3d. The admiral's share of the Havana prize-money, also won in 1762, was no less than £122,697 10s. 6d.; but that was after the capture not of a ship only, but of a great naval base and of all contained in it. As for the *Hermione* treasure, it was conveyed from Portsmouth to London in twenty waggons, decorated with the British colours flying over those of Spain, and was escorted by a party of seamen. At Hyde Park Corner it was received by a troop of Light Horse, which accompanied it thence to the Tower. A spectacle such as that must have sent hundreds of adventurous youngsters away, determined to take up the naval career. But that career had another aspect. The war ended by the Treaty of Fontainebleau in 1763 was fearfully costly in the matter of life—so costly, indeed, that the statistics, unless they were of an official character, would be absolutely incredible. The number of seamen and marines employed during the campaign was 184,893. Of these only 1,512 were killed in action or by accident, but in the seven years no fewer than 133,708 men had perished by disease or were reported missing. Doubtless there were many deserters among the missing; yet, unhappily, it is but too clear that, especially upon some stations, the mortality was shocking. Captains had scarcely begun to take an intelligent interest in sanitary matters.

Concerning the social life of the Royal Navy during the

first three quarters of the eighteenth century we know much. It seems to be the fashion among some modern naval writers to question the truth of the pictures drawn by Smollett the novelist, on the ground that, since a naval surgeon of those days was only a warrant officer, and since Smollett while in the Navy was but a surgeon, he can have known little of life as it was in the "great cabin," and saw his scenes and characters from so great a distance as to be unable to appreciate the true proportion and relative importance of things and persons. But these critics perhaps forget that, though Smollett was a surgeon, he was also one of the keenest observers and most accomplished students of human manners and motives; and that in the eighteenth century the position of a warrant officer was far from being what it now is. The verdict of Thackeray was probably more just than is the verdict of the school alluded to, and Thackeray wrote: "He did not invent much, as I fancy, but had the keenest perceptive faculty, and described what he saw with wonderful relish and delightful broad humour." Nor can anyone who takes the trouble to compare Smollett's descriptions of naval life with the descriptions left us by naval officers of executive rank who enjoyed the honour of a commission come to any other conclusion than that upon the whole Smollett told the truth, and exaggerated or caricatured astonishingly little. The critics who would refuse to believe Smollett cannot withhold credit from Captain Edward Thompson, yet the latter tells practically the same tale as the former. Here is what Thompson wrote in 1756 to a young relative then about to enter the service, and what he republished time after time when he was himself of maturer years:—



*Photo: Walker & Cockerell.*

TOBIAS GEORGE SMOLLETT, M.D., R.N.  
(National Portrait Gallery.)

"You now live under the care and protection of a most indulgent parent, where you enjoy all the blessings this world can afford, and his paternal affection. These you must lose immediately on your launching into the sea service, and, though a youth, you will be under the necessity of commencing your own guardian. Here are no backdoors through which you can make your escape, nor any humane bosoms to alleviate your feelings. At once you resign a good table for no table, and a good bed for your length and breadth. Nay, it will be thought an indulgence, too, to let you sleep where day ne'er enters, and where fresh air only comes when forced. You must get up every four hours—for they never forget to call you, though you may forget to rise: but when you begin, I wish you to be vigilant and active. Your light for day and night is a small candle, which is often stuck on the side of your platter at meals, for want of a better convenience. Your victuals are salt and often bad; and if you vary the mode of dressing them, you must cook yourself. I would recommend you always to have tea and sugar; the rest you must trust to, for you'll scarce find room for any more than your chest and hammock, and the latter at times you must carry upon deck to defend you from small shot, unless you keep one of the sailors in fee with a little brandy (which is a good friend at sea): but always drink it mixed with water. . . . Low company is the bane of all young men, but in a man-of-war you have the collected filth of jails; condemned criminals have the alternative of hanging or of entering on board. There's not a vice committed on shore but is practised here the scenes of horror and infamy on board of a man-of-war are so many and so great, that I think they must rather disgust a good mind than allure it."

Again he wrote:

"The disagreeable circumstance and situations attending a subaltern officer in the navy are so many and so hard, that had not the first men in the service passed the dirty road to preferment to encourage the rest, they would denounce it to a man. . . . The state of inferior officers in his Majesty's service is a state of vassalage, and a lieutenant's preferment the greatest in it. The change is at once from a filthy maggot to a shining butterfly. Many methods might be introduced to make the lower officers of more consequence on their duty, and their lives more agreeable to themselves; for the power of reducing them to sweep the decks, being lodged in the breast of a captain, is often abused through passion or caprice. Besides, it is too despotic an authority to exercise on a man who has the feelings of an Englishman. We are likewise to recollect that all commanders of men-of-war are not gentlemen nor men of education. I know a great part are brave men, but a much greater, seamen. . . . The last war, a chaw of tobacco, a rattan, and a rope of oaths were sufficient qualifications to constitute a lieutenant."

It is upon these points that the modern naval critic most often errs when he describes for us the officers of the middle

of the eighteenth century. A gentleman himself, though one too often of very limited reading, he has always found the great majority of his fellow-officers to be gentlemen also; and it pleases him to think that his forbears in the service were for the most part gentlemen too. Alas! he is wrong. Not only Smollett and Thompson, but a score of other contemporary authorities as well, assure us to the contrary on every page of their writings. The majority of officers, then as now, may have been of gentle birth, but the hideous influences to which they were exposed, beginning at a very tender age, spoilt all but a few of them, and turned them into ruffianly boors, capable enough as seamen, but absolutely unfit to associate with even moderately decent people on shore.

Edward Thompson was one of the comparatively few who not only escaped the general corruption of manners, but also found opportunity, amid the preoccupations of a tolerably busy sea life, to become an educated man. He appears to have made a voyage to

Greenland in a merchantman in 1750, when he was not more than twelve years of age; to have subsequently served the East India Company, to have been pressed into a man-of-war, to have fought as a midshipman in the *Stirling Castle* in Hawke's actions with *Conflans*, and, after various services, to have died as Commodore in the *Grampus* on the West Coast of Africa in 1786. It was an ordinary enough naval career at that period; but Thompson differed even from the cultivated naval officer of the day in being also an active, if not always an effective, man of letters. He edited the works of Sir John



REMAINS OF THE  
ROYAL GEORGE.

(Tower of London.)

Edward  
Thompson's  
Life and  
Journals.

Oldham and of Paul Whitehead the poet; he wrote much both in prose and verse, contributing to the language one of its most charming sea songs, "The Topsail Shivers in the Wind."<sup>1</sup> He was the friend of Johnson, Wilkes, Coleman, and indeed most of the distinguished men of his time; and he was, in addition, a pertinacious diarist. That his journals have never been published in full is owing to the fact that they reveal incidents which are hurtful to the pride of a family in which his blood is perpetuated; but Dr. Henry Hayman, into whose hands some portions of them fell, published a mass of entertaining excerpts from them in 1869. Here are a few that illustrate the naval manners and men of the age:

"August 16, 1783.—'I took Burgundy and Champagne with Lord Keppel, and gave him a turtle. A mixed company, but neither wit, humour, nor information. Sea captains can't speak with any degree of ease before their superiors.'

"February 13, 1784.—'No place can vary so much in its aspect as Portsmouth—its colours and concubines ragged; the pavement grass-grown; sales of furniture every day; the coffee-house with scarce a marine officer; dilly's<sup>2</sup> and stages empty in and out; taverns and inns without customers; and yet the prices continue the same.'

"February 15, 1784.—'I paid a visit to Admiral Montague.<sup>3</sup> A coarser, rougher, ruder sea monster never existed.'

"November 28, 1784.—'Lord Rodney set off to France, being ashamed of the evidence he gave on Johnstone's trial against Sutton, which was tantamount to little better than a marine perjury. He gave on oath that he never knew a court-martial held at sea, though he had issued orders for many himself, and at which Lord Hood sat as president.'

"January 23, 1785.—'I passed the day with my friend Jackson, where I met Mr. Masterman and Sir Geo. Young. Mr. Masterman ably described that our want of success in the last war arose from the faction of a party among our officers. Sir Sam. Hood<sup>4</sup> denied the assistance within his ability to Adm. Graves in the *Chesapeake*, and to Rodney on the 10th of April—for how could his squadron be equally engaged that had few or none killed? The plunder of the public by all was too atrocious, from Sir E. Hughes, in India, to Admiral Arbuthnot, in America, who shared the profits of rapine with his secretary Green, who was known through the fleet to be the most profligate and prostituted knave.'

<sup>1</sup> Set by Hook, and later by Arne.

<sup>2</sup> *I.e.* diligences.

<sup>3</sup> John Montague, then Admiral of the Blue and Commander-in-Chief at Portsmouth. Charnock gives him the "reputation of a man possessing the strictest integrity and a most benevolent heart, unhappily alloyed by some intemperance."

<sup>4</sup> Hood's relations with Rodney are fully shown in "Letters Written by Sir Samuel Hood" (Navy Records Society, 1895).

In an autobiographical work which Thompson, writing anonymously, published in the *London Magazine* in 1774-75, there is a very full description of the sea life of the time in a man-of-war. The most characteristic passages are, unfortunately, unquotable, but some account of the officers of the *Stirling Castle* in 1755-56, when she was commanded by Captain (afterwards Admiral Sir Samuel) Cornish, may be

Naval  
Officers  
about 1755.



SAMUEL, FIRST VISCOUNT HOOD, BY L. F. ABBOTT.

(National Portrait Gallery.)

cited, since it can scarcely be doubted that the officers were types. The captain of marines appears to have been the most disagreeable of Thompson's fellow-officers :

"Contradiction was the darling of his tongue and brain, and rudeness and quarrel were his delights. He ever seemed happy to give offence, and a duel was at times a thing he eagerly sought or assiduously shunned, for he had, strictly speaking, his days of fighting and of cowardice. He was an avowed foe to all persons; he made it an invariable rule to affront them wherever he met them. . . . No man could mess with him; he therefore lived in his cabin by himself, a hermit amidst 500 men. He drank much, and grew more unpleasant as the barometer of Bacchus rose;



and if any man would risk his head and bones for the sake of his claret, he was sure to have enough of his wine and his fists. I once was present at a scene of this sort, where a great company had dined and retired. He and an Irish lieutenant were left the guardians of the empty bottles and glasses. For some time he appeared pleased with his companion, till some assertion in his arguments produced the lie direct. The opprobrious word was replied to with a bottle, and bottle begat bottle; then howls, plates, glasses, and everything that could be thrown. . . . Such a mixture of cowardice and valour never met in one man. He would fight duels with an appetite; and yet I saw him eat physic nuts in the West Indies, that he might not come to the attack he was ordered to perform: and this man was a soldier, and suffered to be in the king's service. The lieutenants were as motley as they were many. The first was a brave old man of Scotland, who died in an action with a French frigate; the second was a swab, who beat out all the teeth of his black servant with a boot-jack; the third was an empty, drunken fungus, all puff-paste, ignorance, and impertinence: the fourth was an agreeable coxcomb, that could read and write but little, and yet would sit for hours with a folio before him to have the credit of being a student; but he was a smart sailor and a gallant fellow. The parson was a tame, ignorant, moral man; the surgeon was without any knowledge of his profession, and preferred bumbo to every other consideration; the lieutenant of marines was a scholar and a veteran soldier, that had fought the battle and ably sung the fight. These . . . filled up the list of officers under whom I had the honour to serve in a voyage to New York, where we arrived on August 9th, 1756."

And we may safely conclude that the *Stirling Castle* was officered not very differently from the other 64-gun ships of her day.

C. RAY-  
MOND  
BEAZLEY.  
Explora-  
tion.

Anson's  
Voyage

AFTER the time of Dampier, the chief English pioneers of maritime discovery are Anson and Cook. The former's voyage, however, was of military interest first and foremost; it was undertaken in consequence of the war between Great Britain and Spain which broke out in 1739 (p. 14), and its object was especially to attack the Spanish possessions in Peru and other parts of South America. Anson's ship, the *Centurion*, which alone persisted to the end, was a 60-gun vessel, manned by over 400 sailors, and with it sailed four other men-of-war, a sloop-of-war, and two victualling ships, September 8th, 1740. The passage to Madeira took forty days, through the hindrance of contrary winds; but the expedition "crossed the Equinoctial" on the 28th November, and sighted the coast of Brazil on the 16th December. Proceeding down the shore of South America,

1784]

and sounding, as they claimed, more thoroughly than had ever been done before, Anson's fleet, after touching at St. Julian's Bay



ADMIRAL ANSON.

(From "Our Naval Heroes": John Murray. By permission of the Right Hon. the Earl of Lichfield.)

in Patagonia, escaped an encounter with the Spanish force sent to intercept them, but suffered terribly from stormy weather off the Horn. The day of the passage of Le Maire's Strait was

indeed the "last cheerful day the greatest part of the crew ever lived to enjoy." Scurvy attacked the men and storms shattered the vessels, Anson's ship at last arriving at the rendezvous of Juan Fernandez with only 167 men out of nearly 500. Here he was joined by two other ships of his squadron and made a stay of some time, not without finding curious proofs of Selkirk's occupation "about thirty-two years ago."

Successes  
against  
Spain.

At last, on the 8th September, 1741, the fleet started again, to begin offensive operations against Spain, with crews for the three remaining ships which would have been barely sufficient to man the *Centurion* alone. The only comfort was that "nothing was to be apprehended from the naval power of Spain in this part of the world." Anson set to work at once, therefore, captured several small prizes, stormed Payta, and cruised off Acapulco (February-March, 1742) for the Manila galleon: but as the sailing of the treasure-ship was put off, he left the American coast in March, 1742, crossed the Pacific, and touched at the Ladrões (August, 1742), where he refitted in the "happy isle" of Tinian. His men had begun to suffer again from the scurvy, and this change on land was invaluable.

Crossing  
of the  
Pacific.

Proposed  
Escape  
from  
Tinian.

While on shore with most of his men, Anson had the misfortune to lose his ship for a time: the *Centurion* was driven from her moorings, and lost sight of between the 22nd September and the 11th October, 1742. In the interval Anson, at once resigning himself to a lasting separation, had set about devising a plan to save his men. His method was to haul on shore a small Spanish prize they had taken, saw her asunder, and lengthen her twelve feet, which would enlarge her to near forty tons burden and enable her to carry them all to China. The ship's carpenters were fortunately on shore with their chests of tools; the smith, too, with his forge, but not the indispensable bellows. This had to be improvised: for some time they were puzzled by the want of leather; however, they had hides in plenty, and with a hogshead of lime they found already prepared on shore they tanned a few hides, and a gun-barrel served their hastily made and strongly scented bellows for a pipe. The new barque was provisioned with cocoanuts, rice, and jerked beef, and furnished with eighty charges of ammunition—all they could muster—a pocket compass, "little better than the toys made for schoolboys," and a makeshift quadrant

With such indomitable pluck were the difficulties of the position faced and overcome, when the return of the ship again changed the look of things; and on the 21st of October the whole crew left Tinian together, after destroying the vessel constructed with such care. From Tinian Anson made for Macao, and, passing by Fornosa, reached it on the 12th of November; the river of Canton, off the mouth of which he now lay, was then the only Chinese port frequented by European ships. Here he refitted the *Centurion* after infinite trouble with Celestial officialism, and, returning to the Philippines, captured the Manila galleon off Cape Espiritu Santo. The prize, valued at near 1,500,000

**Capture  
of the  
Manila  
Galleon.**



HALF-CROWN MINTED FROM CAPTURED SPANISH SILVER.

dollars, was much larger than the *Centurion*, and had 550 men and 64 guns. She was very well furnished with small arms and particularly provided against boarding, but, with all her advantages, she struck after less than three hours' fighting, having 67 killed in the action and 84 wounded, while the *Centurion* had only two killed and seventeen wounded, of whom all but one recovered. "Of so little consequence are the most destructive arms in untutored and unpractised hands."

Returning again to Macao, Anson sold the galleon and set out for England by the Cape of Good Hope. He left the Chinese coast on December 15th, 1743, touched at the Cape on the 11th March, 1744, and escaping with marvellous good fortune a hostile French fleet in the Channel, as he had escaped the intercepting Spanish squadron of Joseph Pizarro off Pata-

**Anson's  
Return.**

gonia, anchored at Spithead (June 15th) after an absence of three years and nine months. The prize-money was transported to London on thirty-two waggons, to the sound of military music. The narrative of the voyage went through four large editions in one year, was translated into seven European languages, and made a greater literary success than any maritime journal of earlier time.

The interval between Anson and Cook is filled up by the voyages of Byron, Wallis, and Carteret, as well as by some progress in the exploration of North America, which is now beyond the scope of a brief narrative. It may be noted, however, that in 1752 the trustees in whom the colony of Georgia (p. 45) had been vested surrendered their charter to the Crown, and so closed the career of the settlement as a philanthropic enterprise. But the scientific expeditions to the Pacific which immediately preceded Cook do strictly belong to this section, and though now almost entirely forgotten, they were not without results.

Explora-  
tion of the  
Pacific.

Byron.

John Byron, who was sent out in 1764 (2nd July) with the *Dolphin* and *Tamar*, had served under Anson as a midshipman in the *Wager*, and after his shipwreck on the coast of Chili had written that account of his sufferings which his grandson the poet alludes to in "Don Juan," when he wants to make his hero a more interesting martyr than any in "My grand-dad's Narrative." In his voyage of 1764 to the South Seas he insists particularly on the truth of the Patagonian giants, who had been reduced by some to the ordinary stature of tall men. After taking possession of the Falkland Islands (p. 268), he doubled Cape Horn and stood across the Pacific, skirting the northern side of the Low Archipelago, and discovering some of the northernmost islands of the group. Especially he laid claim to the "Saint George's Islands," found in 14° 5' S. latitude and 145° W. longitude. But these were small results to what he might have achieved had he zigzagged and quartered over his ground in a systematic pursuit of fresh discoveries. The Society Islands were close by his track, but he seems to have been more anxious to follow Anson's course and to make a record voyage round the world than to increase the knowledge of the Pacific. He returned on May 9th, 1766, after twenty-two months' sail; and it was proudly recorded of him that "no

1784]

navigator had ever compassed the world in so short a space of time," as if that were the end and object of exploring ventures.

Much more satisfactory was the voyage of Wallis and Carteret in the *Dolphin* and the *Swallow* (1766-68). Carteret had been Byron's lieutenant in the voyage of 1764; now in the *Swallow*, after separating from Wallis and the *Dolphin* while clearing Magellan's Straits (April 11th, 1767), he went to refit at Masafuero, and prepared for some real work in the old and long-

Wallis  
and  
Carteret



COMMODORE BYRON AND THE PATAGONIANS.

(Havellsworth's "Voyages," 1773.)

neglected fashion of "searching out of unknown parts." On July 2nd, 1767, he discovered Pitcairn's Island; thence, sailing in a north-west direction, he fell in with a large number of unnoticed lands on the way to New Guinea, such as the Duke of Gloucester's, Gower's, Simpson's, Carteret's, Hardy's, Wallis's, Leigh's, and Queen Charlotte's Islands. On reaching New Britain, he made an important addition to Dampier's work. St. George's Bay, supposed to be only an inlet, was found to be really a strait dividing New Britain proper from a second country which Carteret called New Ireland. Finally, after


New  
Ireland.

discovering and naming the islands of Sandwich, Byron, New Hanover, the Duke of Portland, and several others, he made his way home to England by the Philippines, Java, and the Cape of Good Hope, and so concluded the most useful exploring voyage that had been made since Dampier's time (March 20th, 1769). Captain Wallis, who brought home an interesting collection of "different instruments used by savages," returned a year before Carteret, having discovered, or resighted, as he claimed, fifteen separate islands, among them the famous Tahiti, first seen by Quiros, "the last of the Spanish heroes," and called by him Sagittaria, but now renamed by the English captain after King George III. His voyage immediately preceded one that has cast back some of its fame to the forerunner whose memory it has preserved.

Cook's  
First  
Voyage.

In 1768 the Royal Society persuaded the Government to despatch a vessel to the South Seas, under James Cook, for the purpose of observing the transit of Venus over the sun's disc, visible at Tahiti. Cook was the son of an agricultural labourer, and had run away to sea from the haberdasher to whom he was apprenticed. He had served as ship's boy on northern coasters, had managed to enter the Navy, and had first made himself a name as marine surveyor of the coasts of Newfoundland and Labrador. He was now forty years of age, when greatness was thrust upon him by the offer of the Royal Society. On the 25th August, 1768, he sailed from Plymouth Sound as lieutenant in command of the *Endeavour*, a peaceful ship bound on a peaceful errand—science without filibustering. Charles Green accompanied him as astronomer, Joseph Banks and Solander as naturalists, Buchan as draughtsman, Parkinson as painter. On New Year's Day, 1769, the crews began to complain of cold, as they neared the Horn; on the 11th January they sighted the Falkland Islands, and soon after this, Tierra del Fuego.

On the 22nd January, 1769, Cook began his passage through Le Maire's Strait; on the 26th he doubled Cape Horn and entered the Pacific. Sailing for several weeks to the westward, he made many of the islands sighted the year before by Bougainville, and discovered others himself. On the 11th April he reached Tahiti, and, anchoring in Port Royal Bay, prepared to land.



OTAHEITE SURRENDERED TO CAPTAIN WALLIS.  
(Hawkesworth's "Voyages," 1773.)



The  
Society  
Islands.

On the 3rd of June the transit of Venus was observed, and the ships left on the 13th of the same month. This visit of Cook's resulted in the first thorough exploration of the most celebrated of all the smaller Pacific islands and of the attendant group called the Society Islands. The elaborate observations now made upon the habits, government, religion, morals (or immorals), and character of the Tahitians were invaluable for future work, and gave quite an improved conception of the



A NATIVE DANCE AT OTAHEITE, AFTER J. B. CIPRIANI.

(Hackesworth's "*Voyages*," 1773.)


function of an explorer. It was not merely a discovery of new lands, but a complete description of new races, that was now aimed at. Thievish without rascality, licentious without shame and without malice, amiable and confiding to excess, the Tahitians, as Cook found them, were true children of nature.

On the 15th August Cook finished his discoveries among the Society Islands, and on the 7th of October arrived off the north-east coast of New Zealand at a point he named Poverty Bay. This great island had been visited in 1642 by Tasman, but had been neglected by explorers since that time. The natives here

New  
Zealand.

1784]

were found to be very different from the amiable Tahitians. Ferocious cannibals as they were, they threatened their visitors on the latter attempting to land; but Cook coasted in safety the whole eastern shore of the north island, from Cape Turnagain to the North Cape, after which he began descending the western side. By the end of March, 1770, he had circumnavigated both



CAPTAIN JAMES COOK, F.R.S.

(After the portrait by Nathaniel Dance at Greenwich Hospital.)

the two main islands of New Zealand, and thus disproved their connection with any great southern continent.

On the last day of March the *Endeavour* left New Zealand, and, sailing west, on the 18th April Lieutenant Hicks sighted land directly ahead, which proved to be the southern point of New Holland, or, as we now call it, Australia. Cook sailed on north along this coast, and on the 21st of April first descried ascending smoke, proving the country to be inhabited. On the 13th May natives were seen on the shore, and a landing was

Australia.

Botany  
Bay.

effected; immediately after this Botany Bay was reached and named, from the collection of plants and flowers made here by Banks and Solander. Escaping from the reef which the ship struck on the 10th June, Cook repaired in Endeavour River, edged the Great Barrier Reef, first from outside and then from inside, and, taking possession of the whole coast from lat.  $38^{\circ}$  S. to  $10^{\circ}$  in the name of George III., and by the title of New South Wales, entered Torres Straits. Passing between New Guinea and New Holland, now conclusively proved to be different islands, he reached Batavia in Java on the 8th October, losing here by fever and pestilence nearly thirty officers and men out of a crew which had remained perfectly healthy during the voyage. From this point Cook made good speed homewards, and anchored in the Downs on the 12th July, 1771, after a voyage of three years, which had dwarfed every other discovering venture of the English people for the past hundred years.

Cook's  
Second  
Voyage.

He was raised to the rank of commander, and sent out again in search of any traces to be found (or disproved) of the great southern continent, and especially of a certain doubtful Cape Circumcision, supposed to have been sighted by Benoit, the French navigator, in 1709, to the south of the Cape of Good Hope, in lat.  $54^{\circ}$  S. and long.  $11^{\circ}$  E. He sailed in charge of two ships, the *Resolution* and *Adventure*, on the 13th July, 1772; and, parting from the Cape of Good Hope on the 22nd November, sought in vain for the imagined land till the 1st February, 1763, by which time he had satisfied himself that Cape Circumcision was nothing more than a point of some great ice-field. Crossing the Antarctic Circle on January 16th, 1773, the *Resolution* lost sight of the *Adventure* on February 8th; on the 17th Cook first noticed the southern counterpart to the Aurora Borealis; but on the 16th of March, while in lat.  $59^{\circ}$  S., and long.  $146^{\circ}$  E., having beaten along close to the 60th southern parallel from off the Cape of Good Hope to the south of Tasmania, he abandoned for a time the search after a Southern continent, that was now proved to lie, if existing at all, in latitudes too high for any useful result. On the 26th March, 1773, he anchored at Dusky Bay, close to the most southern point of New Zealand, having sailed 11,000 miles in 117 days, without once seeing land. Proceeding onward to the rendezvous in Queen Charlotte's Sound (New Zealand), where he found the

His  
Search  
for the  
Antarctic  
Continent.

1784]

*Adventure* once again on the 18th of May, Cook was in some danger from waterspouts, one of which passed within sixty yards of his ship's stern. With his two vessels he then sailed the Southern Pacific as far as long.  $140^{\circ}$  W. in search of land between the latitudes of  $41^{\circ}$  and  $46^{\circ}$  S. The huge seas setting from every direction convinced Cook that no land was near, and on the 17th August he made Tahiti. Taking two natives with him, to supply the place of the two he had lost on his first voyage, the commander sailed on to the Friendly Islands early in October, returning to New Zealand in November.<sup>1</sup>

He left the great southern island again in December, 1773, on a last search for the Austral continent; and on the 23rd had reached latitude  $67^{\circ}$ , when he was stopped by ice on the very edge of the Antarctic Circle. So, turning back, he explored the vast tract of unknown sea to the north of this in and about longitude  $130^{\circ}$  to  $140^{\circ}$  without finding any land; and, again, crossing into the Tropics, sighted Easter Island on the 11th March, 1774, after 104 days out of sight of land.<sup>2</sup> Since Roggevoïn's discovery this had been scarcely visited, but Cook recognised it from the gigantic statues on the coast which the Dutch had described. In April he visited the Marquesas, discovered in 1595 by Mendana, revisited Tahiti and carefully coasted the islands, now renamed the New Hebrides, off the north-east coast of Australia—the *Espíritu Santo* of Quiros, the *Grandes Cyclades* of Bougainville. He followed this up with an important discovery—of the great island of New Caledonia; but being unable to get provisions here, he returned to New Zealand; and, after a stay on this coast from the 18th October to the 10th November, left for Cape Horn, to search once more after a southern continent in the ocean tracts south of that cape. On the 21st December he was in Christmas Sound, *Tierra del Fuego*, and, after doubling the Horn and discovering various small islands in high southern latitudes—especially South Georgia, 14th January, 1775, and a few days later Sandwich Land—he reached the Cape of Good Hope on 19th–21st March, 1775, and heard news of the *Adventure*, which had already passed there on her way home. On the 29th–30th July he landed at

<sup>1</sup> On the 30th October the two ships separated for the last time.

<sup>2</sup> On 27th January, 1774, he reached  $71^{\circ} 10'$ , his farthest point to the south.

Plymouth, after three years' absence and with the loss of only four men—a decisive victory over the scurvy.

Cook's  
Third  
Voyage.

Cook's third voyage was primarily an attempt to solve the question of the North-West Passage, as Baffin had resolved to try it in his last days, from the side of Asia. On the 12th July, 1776, he left Plymouth with the *Resolution*, followed on the 10th August by his consort the *Discovery*, under Captain James Charles Clerke. The vessels joined company at the Cape of

Good Hope, November 10th. Arriving at Tasmania in December, 1776, he lay in Queen Charlotte's Sound, New Zealand, for a fortnight in February, 1777; he then discovered the Hervey (Cook's) Islands, where he especially noticed and described the natives of Mangaia. In the Society Islands he planted pineapple and melon seeds, restored his Tahitian friend Omari to his home (in Huahine), and then sailed north for Behring Straits. On the way he discovered, in February,



A NEW ZEALANDER.

(Capt. J. Cook, "Voyage towards the South Pole," 1777.)

1778, the islands which he named after the Earl of Sandwich, then First Lord of the Admiralty, and, sailing north-east, struck the coast of America at about the same point where Francis Drake reached his farthest in New Albion in 1579. From this, coasting north, he reached Nootka Sound late in March, and renamed it King George's Sound. He left here on the 26th April, and entered a deep inlet of the sea, as he supposed. It proved, however, to be a river; and after following its course 200 miles from the mouth, he left it again on the 5th June, and by the 7th August had reached the western extremity of America, in 66°, which he named Cape Prince of Wales.

Thence sailing westward, he was off the coast of Asia by nightfall, having sighted the two continents within one day. On the 12th August, while sailing north, both were in sight at the same moment. Now, however, on passing through Behring's Straits, Cook found himself at the edge of the ice-fields in 71° north (August 17th). Turning back from this mass, as compact as a wall, twelve feet high and stretching to east and west as far as could be seen, the English retraced their journey through the straits to the island of Oonalaska, south-west of Norton Sound, where they met with three Russian carriers who possessed storerooms and a little sloop of thirty tons, and knew of the past explorations of Kamschatka, Behring, and others in the Russian service.

Cook finally left Behring's Straits on the 26th October, and on the same day of the next month found himself among the Sandwich Islands. He discovered several islands not before noticed, and stayed at Hawaii till the

4th February, 1779, when his vessels started on their way. Compelled by stress of weather to return on the 11th February, he became involved in a contest with the natives through a theft (and consequent scuffle) which happened two days afterwards. He failed to entice the king on board his ship, where he intended to keep him as a hostage, and a skirmish in the harbour in which a chief had been killed caused the crowd of natives on shore, who had dissuaded their king from

Search for  
the North-  
West  
Passage.



OMAI, BY SIR JOSHUA REYNOLDS, P.R.A.

(By permission of the Right Hon. the Earl of Carlisle.)



INTERIOR OF AN INDIAN DWELLING, NOOTKA SOUND.

(Cook's "Voyages.")

going with the English captain, to attack the man they had deified as an *orono* a few months before. While Cook faced the mob no one ventured to strike him, but his own kindness of heart threw away this advantage. He was last seen alive as he turned round to his men in the boats ordering them to stop firing, but at this moment he was stabbed in the back, and fell face foremost into the water, dead (February 14th, 1779). After great difficulty and some bloodshed, his remains were recovered on the 20th—at least, his hands, skull, thigh and leg bones, and feet, with his gun and shoes. Thus ended the life and work of the greatest explorer of the eighteenth century, one of the most fruitful benefactors of the human race, the true father of our Australian colonies, the finisher of the main track of oceanic discovery. He was one of the few men who literally rose from the ranks to first-class eminence—a thing much harder and much rarer than common talk would sometimes suggest. Had he returned in safety from his third voyage, it is not hard to believe that rumour would have been right, and that the King, who valued him as he deserved, would have knighted the man whom the French Government, at Turgot's instance, had so honoured by excepting his ship and himself from all hostilities as a "benefactor of every nation." To the last his spelling and his writing were elementary; on the other hand, he was a finished surveyor, an excellent mathematician, a heaven-born genius in that science of navigation where genius is indeed "the infinite capacity for taking pains."

Cook's  
Death.

THE Act of Toleration of 1689, by granting liberty of worship, gave to Nonconformity in some sense a recognised place among the institutions of the country. Its meeting-houses were henceforth registered, and by this legal formality placed under the protection of the King's courts; property given for religious uses was secured by trust-deeds which were recognised by the legal authorities; and Nonconformist ministers, being duly licensed and solemnly sworn, acquired thereby a quasi-clerical character which secured exemption from serving on juries or as churchwardens and overseers, to which laymen were liable. On being now free—for the first time since the Restoration—to assert themselves openly as distinct and self-supporting com-

JOHN  
BROWN.  
Noncon-  
formity,  
1689-1815.



**Chapel  
Building.**

munities, the Nonconformists had all at once to face the necessity of providing themselves with places of worship. During the period of Cromwell's ascendancy in religious matters Presbyterian and Independent ministers were under no such necessity, they being gradually put in possession of national benefices as vacancies arose on death or deprivation. But now, on receiving liberty of conscience under William III.,



A NONCONFORMIST MINISTER, 1711.

(*Tempest*, "Cries of London.")

there were no churches for them to occupy beyond the few built during the time of persecution or under the Declaration of Indulgence. From the Restoration to the Revolution their meetings were either suspended or held in the open air or in private buildings. The first thing, therefore, to do now was to provide local habitation for their communities and their principles. To this they addressed themselves with considerable energy. From a Parliamentary return (1853, No. 156) we find that from 1688 to 1690 no fewer than 939 places of meeting were registered; in the next ten years 1,279 more were added, and by 1720 the number had increased to 4,374. The great majority of these were mere temporary buildings, such as houses, barns, rooms, registered to be used while more

permanent meeting-houses were being erected. In 1715 Daniel Neal obtained a return of the number of free churches in England and Wales, which he gives as 1,150; but as this merely includes Independents and Baptists, and takes no note of Quakers, who had eighty permanent communities in Yorkshire alone, or of Presbyterians, who had from thirty to forty congregations in Lancashire and were numerous in some other counties, the list is evidently defective. We shall probably not be far from correct if we state that in the quarter of a century which

had elapsed between the accession of William III. and the death of Queen Anne some fifteen hundred places of worship had been opened and kept open.

Some of these had not been long built before they were demolished. The Dissenters, whose interests were bound up with the Hanoverian succession, were unanimously on the side of the King against the Pretender; consequently, when in 1715



A QUAKER MEETING.

(From an engraving [portion] in Misson's "*Mémoires*.")

the Pretender was proclaimed as James III., the Jacobites raised the cries of "Church in danger!" "High Church and Sacheverell!" and "No Presbyterianism!" as in the days of Queen Anne, and proceeded to pull down or set fire to the meeting-houses of the Dissenters. At Oxford their places of worship were all destroyed, so were chapels at Wrexham and Nuneaton, and also many in Staffordshire and other parts of England. On the suppression of the rebellion, the Dissenters waited upon the king, and, referring to the treatment they had

Jacobite  
Attacks  
in 1715.

received, went on to say that whenever there had been a design to introduce Popery and arbitrary power into England the Protestant Dissenters had generally been the first to be attacked.



THE QUAKERESS.

(*Tempest*, "Cries of London.")

The king, in reply, expressed his concern at the "unchristian and barbarous treatment" which they had received, and promised compensation.

The political history of Nonconformity in the eighteenth century is largely concerned with the endeavour to set aside certain disabilities which still clung to its adherents even after the Act of Toleration had given them legal status. The Corporation Act of 1661 provided that no person could be elected as mayor, alderman, recorder, bailiff, town-clerk, or common councilman of any city, borough, or corporation who had not, within one year next before such election, taken the sacrament of the Lord's Supper according to the rites of the Church of England. The Test Act of 1673, it is quite certain, was aimed, not at the Nonconformists,

but only at the Popish recusants, the nation thinking itself to be in danger of Popery from the king, and from the Duke of York as heir presumptive to the throne. At the same time, it did affect them by widening the scope of the Corporation Act. It provided that every person who should be admitted into any office, or receive any pay by reason of any patent or grant of his Majesty, or hold any command or place of trust under or by his authority in England and Wales, Berwick, the Royal Navy, or the islands of Jersey and Guernsey, must within six months take the oaths and subscribe the declaration against transubstantiation, and must also within six months receive the sacrament according to the usage of the Church of England in some public church on some Lord's Day immediately after divine service, and produce a certificate from

Noncon-  
formist  
Dis-  
abilities.

the minister and churchwardens to show that he had done so. Any person convicted of executing any such office without complying with the conditions laid down was henceforth disabled from suing in a court of law, acting as guardian or executor, taking any legacy or deed of gift, or bearing any public office, and was further liable to a penalty of £500.

These Acts, remaining unaffected by the Act of Toleration, were felt by the Nonconformists to be a serious grievance. They declared their readiness to take the oaths of allegiance, abjuration, and supremacy required, but objected to receiving the sacrament after the manner of the Church of England—not merely because they did not belong to that Church, but still more because they felt it a sort of sacrilege to take a solemn religious act of any Church, appointed only for religious purposes, and use it as mere qualification for civil office. In their view, it would tend to degrade religion and bring it into contempt—as Cowper, later in the century, expressed it:

“To make the symbols of atoning grace  
An office-key, a pick-lock to a place.”

They pointed out that so far as the Corporation Act was concerned its effect had been to disqualify many men of substance and capacity, and in some cases to throw the management of public affairs into the hands of incompetent people, to the prejudice of corporations, the discouragement of industry, and the decay of trade. And as for the Test Act, which was intended to guard against the danger of Popery from the prince on the throne and his presumptive heir, it was now no longer needed, inasmuch as the reigning king was a Protestant, and the succession was fixed in a House zealously attached to the Protestant religion.

The Lord's  
Supper as  
a Test.



THE QUAKER.  
(Tempest, "Cryes of London.")

A further cause of grievance was found in the Occasional Conformity Act of 1711, which provided that any person holding any civil or military office who should be found in a conventicle, or in any religious meeting of more than ten persons other than one conducted according to the rites of the Established Church, should forfeit the sum of £40, and be disabled for the future from holding any public office.

Agitation for  
Repeal.

In 1717 an agitation was commenced for the repeal of these Acts, and the following year Earl Stanhope introduced a Bill into the House of Lords for the purpose. He asserted the rights of Dissenters to the full privileges of citizenship, and contended that the measure proposed would have the effect of strengthening the Church of England rather than weakening it. He was supported by Bishop Hoadly in an eloquent speech on behalf of the principles of Christian liberty, maintaining that all religious tests were an abridgment of the natural rights of man, an injury to the State, and a scandal to religion. Hoadly was followed on the same side by the Bishops of Gloucester and Lincoln, but the most telling speech of all was that by Bishop Kennet, of Peterborough, who broadly declared that the arbitrary measures of persecution adopted in the past had brought contempt on the clergy and disaster to the State. He ridiculed the cry of "Church in danger!" which, he said, had been raised for sinister purposes, and merely amounted to "a mighty noise in the mouths of silly women and children." On a division the second reading was carried by 86 votes to 68; but on going into committee the clauses relating to the Test and Corporation Acts were withdrawn from the Bill, and it passed without them. The reason given for withdrawal was that Lord Sunderland assured the king that to attempt to repeal the Test Act would only be to ruin the Bill; the Dissenters were, therefore, informed through Lord Barrington that it was the wish of the king that, while the Occasional Conformity Act was repealed, the question of the Test and Corporation Acts should be deferred. In deference to this wish of the king, they yielded the point for the present, on the express assurance that before long these Acts also should be repealed. It was, however, more than a century before they were. The matter was delayed from year to year, on the plea of Sir Robert Walpole that the time was inopportune, or, as the queen put it, that "all times were not proper to do

proper things." Further attempts to secure repeal were made in 1787 and in 1789, when Mr. Beaufoy took charge of bills for the purpose in the House of Commons; and again in 1790, when Fox brought the matter forward, making a memorable speech in vindication of religious liberty and of the public services of the Dissenters. By this time, however, the French Revolution had produced a scare against liberty, and the bill was lost by an overpowering majority. It was not till the 9th May, 1828, that a bill for the Repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts received the royal assent.

Still several distinct steps forward were meanwhile made in the direction of liberty. In 1732 the body still in existence, and known as the Dissenting Deputies, was created to watch over the interests of religious liberty, and in 1754 it proceeded to take action in a case closely affecting their London brethren. In 1742 Robert Grosvenor, who was a Dissenter, was elected to the office of Sheriff, and on his refusal to qualify by taking the sacrament according to the rites of the Church of England was cited by the Corporation before the Court of Queen's Bench, which decided against his claim of exemption. To meet such cases in future, the Corporation then passed a bye-law imposing a fine of £400 upon every person who declined to stand for the office after being nominated, and a fine of £600 upon every person who, being elected, refused to serve. This bye-law was deliberately intended as a means of oppression. When a Sheriff was to be elected, Dissenters, one after another, were nominated, and, as they all refused to serve, the fines were levied, amounting in the course of six years to more than £15,000, which went towards the erection of the new Mansion House.

The Dis-  
senting  
Deputies.

In 1754 it was resolved to make a stand against this oppressive procedure. In that year three Dissenters, one after another, were elected to the office of Sheriff, and, advised by the Deputies, refused to serve and resisted the payment of the fine. They were at once cited to the Sheriff's Court, where judgment was given against them. They then appealed to the Court of Hustings, of which the Recorder of the City was sole judge, and he also gave against them. They then sued for a special commission of five judges, who, in 1762, reversed the decisions of the courts below. The Corporation then brought a writ of error before the House of Lords, when the case was argued at great

Dissent  
and the  
City Cor-  
poration

length in 1767. and judgment given for the Dissenters. It was then that Lord Mansfield gave his memorable utterance, showing that on every ground on which they could rest their plea the Corporation had failed. In eloquent words he denounced the spirit by which they had been animated, declaring that persecution was unreasonable, inconsistent with the rights of human nature, and contrary to the spirit and precepts of the Christian religion. Referring to the bye-law made by the Corporation, he said its professed design was to get fit and able persons to serve the office: but were he to deliver his own suspicion, it would be that they did not so much wish for service as for fines. Dissenters had been appointed to this office—one who was blind, another who was bedridden—not, he supposed, on account of their being fit and able to serve office. In the case before their lordships the defendants were by law incapable, and it was his firm persuasion that they were chosen because they were incapable. They were chosen that they might fall under the penalty of a bye-law made to serve a particular purpose. He concluded by moving their lordships that the judgment be affirmed, which it was.

Steps  
towards  
Freedom.

This gain in the direction of freedom made in 1767 was followed by another in 1779, when Protestant Dissenting ministers and schoolmasters were no longer required to sign the Thirty-nine Articles, but were simply required to make a declaration that they were Christians and Protestants, and accepted the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as containing the revealed will of God. In 1812 the Quakers' Oaths, the Conventicle and Five Mile Acts, which till then had remained on the Statute Book, were repealed, and the Free Churches were placed, in respect to legal protection from disturbance during times of public worship, on an equality with the Established Church. The Unitarians had been excepted from the privileges granted by the Act of Toleration, and till the eighteenth century remained under the ban of the law, conducting their worship and publishing their opinions by sufferance. In 1813, however, a bill was brought into Parliament for the repeal of the statutes of William III. and George III. which made it blasphemy for any person to deny the doctrine of the Trinity and exempted all such persons from the benefit of the Toleration Act. By the passing of this bill the Unitarians came into possession of all the rights enjoyed by other Dissenters.

The Uni-  
tarians  
Relieved.

The history of Nonconformity in the eighteenth century has been divided into two portions as that of the Old Dissent and that of the Modern Dissent, the Old declining towards the middle of the century, and the Modern taking its rise out of the Revival under Wesley and Whitfield. The causes of the decline of the Old Dissent were varied in their action. The men who came out of the Church in 1662, and who gave to Nonconformity its distinctive character and first spiritual impulse, had all passed away, their names being only a dim and indistinct tradition to the younger generation. With the loosing of the personal ties which had bound many aristocratic families to men like Owen, Baxter, and Howe came the drifting away of these families to the Established Church. This was the case not merely in London, but in the provinces. Where there were able and eloquent preachers who were exemplary in their lives, and where the clergy were neither able nor exemplary, the Nonconformists grew by accessions from the professional and trading classes. But when the movement of energy which followed upon the Act of Toleration had spent itself, there came a period of reaction and decline. Dr. Priestley, who knew Lancashire well, reckoned that in the reigns of the first two Georges the Dissenters had diminished in that county by one-third of their original number. The landed gentry, especially of the higher class, many of whom had been Presbyterian from the time of the Commonwealth, had generally forsaken them, and of the old Nonconformist families there was scarcely a representative left in their sanctuaries. The Occasional Conformity Act (1711-18) also told in the same direction. Men like Sir Thomas Abney and Sir John Fryer, aldermen of the City of London, with the mayors of several country corporations, and justices of the peace, were served by private chaplains, and ceased to attend the public worship of their own body, simply going to the communion at their parish churches often enough to save their places.

The Old  
Dissent  
and the  
New.


Drift  
to the  
Church

But while these and similar social forces were at work, the most potent cause of reaction in Nonconformity was the decline of spiritual life. About 1729 complaints began to be heard that the Nonconformist churches were declining in numbers and spiritual efficiency. In a publication entitled "An Inquiry into the Causes of the Decay of the Dissenting Interest," the author questioned the truth of these complaints, maintaining that, while

Decay  
Spirit  
Life.



some communities had sunk into feebleness, several in London had risen to great prosperity. He himself made certain complaints and suggested certain changes by way of improvement. This pamphlet called forth another, from the pen of Philip Doddridge, a man of foremost rank and influence in Nonconformity. Under the title of "Free Thoughts on the Best Means of Reviving the Dissenting Interest," he pointed out that the question as to whether Dissent was growing or declining was not



PHILIP DODDRIDGE.

(From an engraving by Worthington prefixed to his Correspondence)

one of mere religious partisanship, but of truth, honour, and liberty, and in a great measure the cause of serious piety too. In his opinion, the decline of Nonconformity, so far as there was decline, arose from spiritual declension among the professors, and the remedy lay in the revival of practical religion. The great aristocratic families, he contended, were not the strength of Nonconformist churches, but the common people, and that they were to be reached by a strain of preaching not drily orthodox, but earnestly evangelical.

Here Doddridge laid his hand on the cause of decay; for a wave of lifeless Arian teaching had passed over the pulpits both of the Established Church and of the Nonconformist community. In the case of the latter the change came on gradually and stealthily. It was first marked by silence as to the great Evangelical truths urged in an earlier time—a silence which was supposed to arise from dislike to the old modes of stating the truth rather than to the truth itself. Definite teaching was set down as dogmatism, and denounced as offensive and unprofitable. More stress came to be laid on the natural and moral grounds on which Christianity rests, and less on the supernatural and spiritual. The old phrases continued to be used, but came to be emptied of their former meaning. As it has been said, men talked their fathers' language after they had lost their fathers' faith. The religion of the meeting-house subsided into little more than a tradition and a formality.

Arianism

The  
Wesleys  
Movem  
John  
Wesley.

It was during this time of slumber and decay that public attention began to be aroused by two young clergymen who had broken away from the ordinary conventional grooves and modes of Church life. John Wesley, the son of the rector of Epworth, in Lincolnshire, while a student at Oxford, had passed through a series of deep convictions on spiritual things, but the decisive era in his religious life he always noted as having taken place at a fellowship meeting held in Aldersgate Street, while someone was reading Luther on the Galatians to the rest. That day his eyes were opened as never before, and he came to see that living faith was concerned with the living person of Christ rather than with intellectual creeds or theological propositions. As he says, he "felt his heart strangely warmed, that he did trust in Christ, Christ alone, for salvation," and had "assurance given him that Christ had taken away his sin and saved him from the law of sin and death." He came to see that the Spirit of God was not merely in the Bible, but in the souls of living men, giving light and life to the men of the eighteenth century as to those of the first.

If this was fanaticism, it was fanaticism that for more than fifty years bore the strain of one of the most strenuous and perfectly organised lives ever lived. Having preached for some time in such churches as were open to him in London and the provinces, in 1742 he went down to his native place at Epworth.

and, being refused liberty to preach in the church, notice was given that he would preach in the churchyard. Standing on his father's tombstone, he addressed the people who gathered round him, and such was the impression produced that for seven consecutive evenings after that he preached again, producing marvellous results. That week will ever live in the religious history of the period as the real beginning of a great and memorable career.

George  
Whitefield.

His co-worker in the great religious revival then beginning was George Whitefield, who also had been trained for the Church, and had also gone through deep spiritual experiences. While destitute of Wesley's marvellous power of organisation, he was without rival as the pulpit orator of the century in which he lived. Men of the most varied orders of mind bore witness to the profound impression he produced. Those who listened to him were not only interested and convinced, but quickened with a new kind of life. As early as 1739 he commenced field-preaching among the colliers of Kingswood, near Bristol, first to two hundred and afterwards to an audience of ten thousand. Two months later he commenced open-air preaching near London—on Kennington Common, in Hackney Fields and Moorfields, at Smithfield and Mayfair—everywhere with the same overwhelming audiences and with the same marvellous spiritual results. From 1739 till his death in 1770 his work continued on the same lines. When churches or chapels were opened to him, he gladly preached in them; when they were denied, or were too small for his audiences, just as readily he took to the churchyard, the market square, or the village green.

The  
Wesleyan  
Organis-  
ation.

The effect of the labours of Wesley and Whitefield was seen in two different ways—first, in the quickening into new life of the churches already existing, and next in the creation of new societies consolidated into the ecclesiastical system known as Wesleyanism. The system grew out of the necessities which the new life had created. The converts made by preaching had to be gathered into societies, and the societies organised with such institutions as would best suit and help those who had just set out in the Christian life. Through Peter Bohler, John Wesley had come in contact with Moravianism, and from that community he adopted the band-meeting and the love-feast; the watch-night and the covenant meeting were his own ideas. He had



JOHN WESLEY, BY NATHANIEL HONE, R.A.  
(*National Portrait Gallery.*)

hoped to have secured ministers for his societies, as they rose into being, from among the clergy of the Established Church, but he was disappointed in this. He hesitated at first about employing laymen as preachers, for he was a High Churchman in feeling; but powerful preachers like Thomas Maxfield and John Nelson were raised up among his own followers, and he hesitated no longer. The next step in the way of organisation came when the preachers were called together to confer as to their future action. Thus the first Wesleyan Conference was held in 1744, and consisted of six clergymen and at least four lay-preachers. It may furnish an indication of the manner in which this movement steadily grew if we note that twenty-one years later the Conference of 1765 showed that ninety-two itinerant preachers were then in connection, and that the circuits in two years had increased in England from twenty to twenty-five; in Ireland, from seven to eight; and in Scotland, from two to four. This growth not only continued, but increased in ratio. Wesley died in 1791, and in that year there were 278 ministers in connection with the Wesleyan societies. Up to the last Wesley regarded both himself and these societies as belonging to the Established Church, and he died beseeching his adherents never to leave it. Scarcely had he passed away, however, when there rose up a spirit of revolt against what was felt to be ecclesiastical subserviency to the laws of the Church. Wesley had been careful never to hold meetings at the same times as the services were being held in the Church, and also not to allow the celebration of the Sacraments by Wesleyan ministers. Earnest protests were raised on both these points, and after four years of dispute both claims were conceded; the services came to be held at the same hours as in the churches, the sacraments were administered by their own ministers in their own places of worship, and thus the Wesleyans, about 1795, became a separate body from the National Church.

**The Independents.**

Many of those awakened under the great Revival joined other communities. The Independents, owing to their more popular form of government, had preserved more spiritual life among them than the Presbyterians. Priestley, speaking on this matter, says:—"Those who are called Independents retain all the zeal of the old Puritans, and receive daily recruits from the Methodists; and many very numerous societies of Independents.

1784]

have been formed out of that body." Other causes contributed to the growth of Nonconformity at the close of the eighteenth century and the beginning of the nineteenth. If a clergyman were earnest and evangelical, probably his successor would prove the reverse, and the people awakened under his ministry, at his death, sought the same kind of teaching among the Nonconformists to which they had grown accustomed. On the other hand, careless and dissolute clergymen, of whom there were only too many, drove their parishioners into the ranks of Dissent. A clergyman, writing in 1801 of the "Causes for Separation" from the Church, speaks of "the late and present rapid increase of Dissenters"; and of the clerical position as being "considerably altered within the last twenty years by the increase of Dissenting preachers and Dissenting meetings." That there was such increase of Nonconformity is shown by the statistics of registration of their places of worship. From the Parliamentary return of 1853, already referred to (p. 308), it appears that while in the decennial period from 1731-40 the number of meeting-houses registered was only 448, in the period from 1791 to 1800 the number rose to 4,394; from 1801 to 1810, to 5,460; and from 1811 to 1820, to 10,161; making 20,015 in thirty years. Though the great majority of these places registered were dwelling-houses and rooms recognised as temporary buildings, yet they indicate an enormous accession of activity and zeal, and a great increase of numbers in the ranks of Nonconformity, as contrasted with the earlier time.

It is indicated elsewhere (p. 317) how important an influence was exercised on the religious life of the age by the rationalistic philosophy of which the Deists were the chief exponents. But in this period philosophy advances a stage beyond the Deists' rationalism. David Hume (1711-76) was born at Edinburgh. The "Treatise," written during a stay in France (1734-37), was published at London in 1739-40. The full title was, "A Treatise of Human Nature: Being an Attempt to introduce the Experimental Method of Reasoning into Moral Subjects." Hume disappointed with its reception by the public, afterwards worked up its separate parts into new dissertations, more highly polished in form, but reduced in matter by the omission of some investi-

**T. WHITTAKER.**  
Philosophy  
and  
Science.  
Philosophy.

Hume's  
"Treatise"  
and its  
later form.

gations that were at once abstruser and more completely sceptical in result. The most important omissions are the examination into the nature of mathematical truth, and the criticism of the conception of substance, mental as well as material. Hume's later philosophical works corresponding to the parts of the "Treatise" are the "Inquiry Concerning Human Understanding" (1748), the "Dissertation on the Passions," and the "Inquiry Concerning the Principles of Morals" (1751). The "Essays, Literary, Moral, and Political" first appeared in 1741. In a later edition (1758) of the "Essays" there were incorporated the three treatises just mentioned and the "Natural History of Religion," first published in 1757. The "Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion" were posthumously published (1779), but Hume had kept the manuscript by him for a long time.

Hume's  
Work in  
Philosophy.


In its most general aspect, the result of Hume's work was sceptical. By carrying the criticism of Locke and Berkeley to its conclusion, he showed the impossibility, according to the philosophical principles then recognised, of a rational construction by way of demonstration in metaphysics or in natural theology. But Hume's work had also a positive side. In politics, for example, his criticism, by getting rid of all assumptions about an "original contract," prepared the way for inquiry into the historical origins of institutions. Similarly, in relation to the deistic controversy, he showed that to assume a kind of ethical monotheism as the primitive religion of the human race is a mere fancy not based on evidence, and that a polytheism like that of the Greeks and Romans comes much nearer to the character of a primitive or "natural" religion. In his "Attempt to Introduce the Experimental Method of Reasoning into Moral Subjects," Hume appears as one of the founders of associationist psychology. His view of the relation of cause and effect, though a sceptical turn is given to it by contrast with the rationalistic or *a priori* definitions of causality then traditionally accepted, has essentially the character of what is now called pre-eminently the "positive" view; and, in ethics, Hume was the first to give definite formulation to what has since been known as utilitarianism.

The "association of ideas" had long been regarded as a principle manifested in the phenomena of memory. By Hobbes, Locke, and Berkeley it had been implicitly made use of to

1784]

explain more complex mental phenomena. Locke, in a chapter of the "Essay," had introduced the phrase to describe those peculiar associations that get fixed in individual minds through special experience. Hume now proceeded to generalise the principle, putting forward the view that mental "association"

The Association Theory.



DAVID HUME.  
(After Allan Ramsay.)

is a kind of universal attraction comparable to the gravitation of matter. He reduced the grounds of association to three—viz. Resemblance, Contiguity in Time or Place, Cause and Effect. The contents of mind, according to Hume, are "impressions" and "ideas," the latter reproductions of impressions. The laws of association explain how impressions and ideas become combined in their actual order, since every mental state tends to call up again the mental state which it resembles,



or which formerly accompanied or followed or preceded it, or which appeared in the relation to it of cause or effect.

Causation  
and Uni-  
formity.

That cause and effect should be made a separate ground of association of ideas is not quite in harmony, as critics have pointed out, with Hume's theory of causation. When he comes to develop this, he arrives at the conclusion that the only source for the idea we suppose ourselves to have of a causal *nexus* is customary experience. Having found certain events always conjoined in a certain order, we expect that they will continue to be conjoined in the same order. This irrational expectation being all that we find in the case, there is no intuitively-felt necessity in the causal relation. Nor is any particular effect logically deducible from its cause prior to experience. In practice we must argue from causes to effects on the ground of past experience, assuming that future experience will resemble the past. So far as we argue thus, causation must be assumed just as much in mind as in things. In many cases, indeed, we are actually more sure of what a particular person will do under given circumstances than we can be as to the results of the physical properties of matter. Hume, accordingly, in spite of the sceptical element in his theory of causation, belongs to the succession of psychological determinists.

Hume's  
Ethics.

In his ethical theory Hume finds that the ground of our approval of actions is their utility to the agent or to others. There is in man a principle of sympathy by which the good of others is a source of pleasure, and injury done to them a source of pain, even to those who have personally no part in it. The different moral virtues derive their character partly from the relative extent to which desires for personal good and sympathy with others enter into them, partly from the respective shares of spontaneous feeling, and of reasoning about means and ends, in their formation. "Reason" is not a supreme moral principle; it only enables us to calculate the means by which we may attain ends assigned by the feelings, one of which is disinterested benevolence. By these distinctions, Hume contends, the controversy between the schools of "reason" and of "moral sense" may easily be brought to a settlement.

Adam  
Smith's  
Ethics.

Closely related to Hume's ethical doctrine is that of Adam Smith, set forth in his "Theory of Moral Sentiments" (1759). A very distinctive point of Adam Smith's doctrine is the notion

[1784]

of the "impartial spectator." The impartial spectator, through the natural principle of sympathy, represents in himself the motives of others; and, according as he approves or disapproves of them, regards the resulting conduct as morally good or bad. The demand of morality is so to act that the impartial spectator can sympathise with us. We are enabled to pass ethical judgments on ourselves by asking whether, if we were in the place of the impartial spectator, we should sympathise with the motives we are conscious of and approve of the resulting action. Thus, conscience may be regarded as the impartial spectator in our breast.

David Hartley (1704-57) is usually regarded as the father of English associational psychology. This view of him is correct in so far as later Associationism was derived from Hartley rather than from Hume, though Hume had the priority in generalising the principle of association. Hartley's doctrine is set forth in the



ADAM SMITH, BY TASSIE.  
(*Scottish National Portrait Gallery.*)

"Observations on Man: his Frame, his Duty, and his Expectations" (1749). For the first suggestion of his psychological theory he was indebted, not to Hume, but to a clergyman named Gay, who had incidentally made use of the principle of association in morals to explain how means come to be sought as if they were themselves the ends of action. In Hartley's doctrine the attempt is made to reduce all laws of association to that of contiguity. By this single law, not only reminiscence, but the phenomena of perception, thought, emotion, and volition, are to be explained as results of the combination of mental elements. The psychological doctrine of association of ideas is combined

**Hartley's  
Associa-  
tion  
Theory.**

with a theory of the physiological concomitants of mental processes. This is derived from a suggestion of Newton in the "Principia," and consists in the view that there are, corresponding to mental processes, physical "vibrations" in the nervous substance, which leave behind "vibratiuncles" of a

similar kind. These are not regarded as identical with the psychical states, but only as their invariable concomitants. Consistently with his psychophysical doctrine, Hartley is a determinist.

Joseph Priestley (1733-1804), though more original in his contributions to experimental science than to philosophy, is also of some note as a philosophic writer. In 1775 he published an abridged edition of Hartley's "Observa-



DAVID HARTLEY (AFTER SHACKLEWELL).

(From his "Observations on Man," 1810.)

Priestley.

tions" under the title of "Hartley's Theory of the Human Mind on the Principles of the Association of Ideas." Here he detaches Hartley's psychological doctrine from his physical hypothesis. In "Disquisitions Relating to Matter and Spirit" (1777) and "The Doctrine of Philosophical Necessity" (1777) he defends materialism and determinism. Like Hartley, he sought to reconcile his philosophy with belief in Christianity. Theism he regards as proved by the ordering of the universe; and, while rejecting the idea of a natural immortality of the soul, he believes that man is to be supernaturally raised from the dead.

Associa-  
tional  
Ethics.

The doctrine of association of ideas was applied to morals by Abraham Tucker (1705-74) in "The Light of Nature Pursued" (published under the pseudonym of Edward Search, 1768). Tucker is a follower of Locke in general philosophy,

1784]

and of Hartley in psychology. "Every man's own satisfaction" he holds to be the ultimate end for the man himself. Through the will of God, this end is connected with the "general good" to which all the rules of morality have reference. The possibility of disinterested action is explained by the principle of association. Paley (whose system will be dealt with in the next chapter), in his later elaboration of theological utilitarianism, expresses his obligations to Tucker.



RICHARD PRICE, BY BENJAMIN WEST.

(By permission of the Royal Society.)

Richard Price (1723-91) carries forward the intellectualist tradition in morals. Of the earlier English moralists, he most resembles Cudworth. He was an intimate friend of Priestley but in a correspondence between them, published in 1778, Price appears as the champion of free-will and of the unity and immateriality of the human soul. Among his friends was

Price's  
Ethics.

Franklin, to whom he addressed some observations on statistical questions published in the *Philosophical Transactions*, 1769. His "Appeal to the People on the Subject of the National Debt" (1771) is supposed to have influenced Pitt in re-establishing the sinking fund created by Walpole in 1716 and abolished in 1733 (p. 171). In his ethical treatise entitled "Review of the Principal Questions in Morals" (1757) he maintains against Hutcheson that ideas of right and wrong are perceived by the reason, or understanding, and not by a "sense." They are simple ideas incapable of analysis, and are perceived intuitively; actions being in themselves right or wrong. As with Clarke, right and wrong actions are defined as actions that agree or disagree with the true relations of things. In his position that reason, or understanding, can become a spring of action, by imposing the idea of right as a law upon the will, Price anticipates the ethical doctrine of Kant.

#### Science.

What is of greatest scientific interest in this period is the gradual passage of electricity and chemistry beyond the tentative stage. In the older sciences discoveries continued to be made. To the preceding period belongs Bradley's discovery of the aberration of light; but as Bradley became Astronomer Royal exactly in the year 1742, and as his other great discovery of nutation belongs to our present period, his work may be dealt with here.

#### Astro- nomy: Bradley.

James Bradley (1692-1762) has been described by an eminent French man of science<sup>1</sup> as entitled for his discoveries to the most distinguished place among astronomers after Hipparchus and Kepler. The first of his two great discoveries is assigned to the year 1727. A Danish astronomer, Rømer, had already made out the velocity of light by observations on the eclipses of Jupiter's satellites. Bradley was led to his discovery of the aberration of light—which is a consequence of its being transmitted, not instantaneously, but with a finite velocity—by a series of observations undertaken for the purpose of determining the annual parallax of the fixed stars. In the course of these observations he found that the stars had a minute apparent motion different from that which the parallax

<sup>1</sup> Delambre, quoted in Whewell's "History of the Inductive Sciences," ii. 202.

1784]

would produce; and at length, by a happy idea, he hit upon the explanation of the fact. The explanation is that, since light and the spectator on the earth are both in motion, the apparent direction in which the object is seen will deviate slightly from its real direction in accordance with the composition of these motions. Bradley continued the observations by which he had made this discovery: and the result was his other great discovery of the nutation of the earth's axis. This he had thought



A CHEMICAL LABORATORY IN 1747.

*(Universal Magazine, 1747.)*

of at first as a possible cause of the motion due to aberration, but had rejected it as inapplicable. Though it does not explain this particular motion, it turned out to be a fact. A longer series of observations was needed to detect it, because its cycle, instead of being annual, like that of aberration, is a cycle of eighteen years. In this cycle, the earth's pole, besides the motion due to the precession of the equinoxes, moves through a small ellipse, and so changes slightly the apparent place of a star in successive years. Before the end of the half-cycle of nine years Bradley had worked out his theory

connecting nutation with the moon's attraction. By Thomas Simpson and other eminent mathematicians to whom he submitted it his conjecture was verified, and nutation shown to be a necessary result of the law of gravity. The date to which this discovery is assigned is 1747.

Physics  
and Chem-  
istry :  
Black.

Of the first importance during this period, both as a physical and as a chemical investigator, is Joseph Black (1728-99). In chemistry his name is specially associated with the discovery of "fixed air" (carbonic acid, as it is now familiarly called); in physics with that of "latent heat." Black laid the foundation of quantitative chemistry by his systematic use of the balance. Proceeding by quantitative methods, he was able to prove that the mild earths, such as lime and magnesia, on being burnt become caustic through the expulsion of a peculiar kind of air, which is heavier than atmospheric air and will not support animal life. This was called by Black "fixed air," because it was capable of existing not only in the gaseous state, but also in a state of combination in solid bodies like unburnt magnesia and lime. The discovery of "fixed air" was made in 1754. From 1759 to 1763 Black pursued the inquiries that resulted in his theory of latent heat. He found that when a body by the action of heat passes from the solid to the liquid or from the liquid to the gaseous state, heat is communicated, during the whole time required for the change of state, without raising the temperature. The heat that alters the condition, not the temperature, of a body, he called "latent heat." He also proved that substances of different kinds require unequal increments of heat to raise the same mass through the same interval of temperature. This difference is indicated by the term "specific heat." Black was not only a great discoverer, but also a lucid expositor. In 1766 he was elected to the chair of Chemistry at Edinburgh University, and made the subject fashionable by his lectures.

Carbonic  
Acid Gas.

Latent  
Heat.

Priestley  
discovers  
Oxygen.

Many important discoveries in pneumatic chemistry were made by Priestley, the most important of all being the discovery of oxygen, or, as Priestley called it, "dephlogisticated air," in 1774. Priestley found that the red oxide of mercury (red precipitate) when heated evolved a gas which was a much better supporter of combustion than common air. He called it "dephlogisticated air" because he supposed that its action might

1784]

be explained by its having been completely deprived of phlogiston. Atmospheric air, he argued, since it is only in part deprived of phlogiston, supports combustion to a limited extent, the process being that the principle of combustion is drawn from the burning body by the air till it is completely phlogisticated. "Phlogisticated air" does not support combustion at all. Priestley had proved that about one-fifth of common air is not phlogisticated; and this constituent of the atmosphere he was able to identify with the air evolved by the red oxide of mercury. Priestley's discovery, taken up by Lavoisier, led to the refutation of the theory of phlogiston, and to a complete reconstruction of chemical science: though Priestley himself continued to hold the theory of phlogiston to the last, and sought to explain in accordance with it all the new facts discovered by himself and others.

**Phlogist  
Caloric,  
and oth  
useful  
figment**

It is interesting to note how the science of this time is characterised by the assumption of various fictitious substances such as phlogiston, each serviceable for the explanation of one group of facts. In the theory of heat, for example, the changes of bodies as regards temperature or state were explained by the entrance or departure of a substance named "caloric." For the explanation of electrical phenomena other distinct fluids were assumed, and were endowed with such properties as seemed required. Like phlogiston, these other conceptions were useful provisionally, and some of them are still used for purposes of mathematical calculation or for convenience of exposition; but they are no longer supposed to represent what takes place in things. They have been expelled partly by the growing co-ordination of the different branches of physics and partly by the further development of mechanical conceptions.

**Electri  
Frankl**

The most conspicuous among the electrical discoverers of the period is Benjamin Franklin, who in 1752 sent over to England from Philadelphia an account of the famous experiment in which, by means of a kite, he drew down electricity from the clouds. By this experiment, which was soon repeated and confirmed in England and France, he established the identity, previously conjectured by himself and others, of thunder and lightning with the phenomena of the electrical discharge. Franklin was an electrical theorist, as well as a discoverer of new



facts, being one of those who worked out the conception of electrical action as due to a single fluid. Electrical attractions and repulsions, according to this conception, depend on changes in the distribution of the fluid. Where it is accumulated in greater quantity, a body becomes positively electrified; the parts of bodies from which it is withdrawn are said to be electrified negatively.

**Watson.**

This theory of electricity as positive and negative had been suggested by Sir William Watson (1715–1807), who also made important experimental discoveries. Besides improving the form of the Leyden jar, invented about 1745, he was the first to observe the flash of light which attends its discharge. In a series of experiments instituted by the Royal Society in order to determine the velocity of electricity he was the chief operator.


**Canton.**

Another eminent discoverer in this field was John Canton (1718–72). Canton was the first in England to verify Franklin's experimental proof of the identity of lightning with electricity. The next year (1753) his paper on "Electrical Experiments, with an Attempt to Account for their several Phenomena," was read before the Royal Society. In this paper he made mention of his discovery that some clouds are positively, and others negatively, electrified. Franklin had made a similar discovery in America, and this circumstance led to a lasting friendship between Canton and Franklin. Canton's most important discovery was probably that of "electrical induction," or the attractions and repulsions which other bodies are caused to exert by the neighbourhood of electrified bodies. He succeeded in giving a theoretical explanation of these phenomena according to the doctrine, then accepted, of "electrical atmospheres."

**Other Researches.**

A more elaborate theory of electrical induction was worked out by *Epinus* and by *Cavendish*. This will be referred to in the next chapter. Here a few other notable experiments may be mentioned. By *Priestley*, *Canton*, and others the phenomenon of "pyro-electricity" was investigated. This consists in the acquisition of electrical polarity by certain substances, of which *tourmaline* is one, under the action of heat. Investigations were also made of the electricity of fishes. The shock of the torpedo was proved to be electric; and *Hunter* studied the anatomy of its electrical organs. In the *Philosophical Transactions* of 1776

Cavendish gave an account of the construction of an artificial torpedo, by which the actions of the living animal were imitated. Robert Symmer, about 1759, made interesting experiments on the attractions and repulsions of silk and worsted stockings of the same and of different colours. Symmer maintained, in an improved form, the theory of two distinct electric fluids, already



BENJAMIN FRANKLIN, BY D. MARTIN.  
(By permission of the Right Hon. Earl Stanhope.)

put forward by Dufay. This theory, like the theory of a single fluid, gradually came to receive adequate mathematical formulation. Electricians now had clearly in view the discovery of a law of electrical force corresponding to the law of gravity.

THE historian, and especially the bird's-eye historian, of English literature may have periods more intoxicating to his sense of the highest literary beauty, fuller of work of various

GEORGE  
SAINT  
BURY.  
Litera

Features  
of the  
Period.

kinds, more distinguished by names of the most world-wide fame, and otherwise more remarkable, than those four decades in the middle of the eighteenth century which form our present subject. But he can hardly have one of a rounder, completer, and more characteristic interest. It is dominated throughout by the presence, and through a large part of it by the undisputed pre-eminence, of the singular and capital figure of Johnson. It sees the rise, culmination, and, for the time, collapse of one of the greatest achievements in prose fiction. It sees in the same way (even if we generously leave Gibbon, with Burke and Reynolds, all of whom partly belong to it, to the next chapter) the solid establishment, for the first time, of a great English School in history. Believing itself to be thoroughly "classical" and "correct," it lays the foundations of the Romantic revival which at its close was to be actually introduced by Burns and Blake, by Crabbe and Cowper; and it witnesses not merely the Romantic excursions of Percy in the right way, but those of Walpole, Macpherson, and Chatterton in ways more or less wrong. It develops, between Classicism and Romanticism, a very curious school of poetry of its own, of which Gray and Collins are the pillars. And, lastly, it has acquired, if not exactly fame, at least notoriety, as the special time—the prime not golden but very much the reverse—of "Grub Street." To these years, from the time when Boyse (the original "Scroggen") was found writing with his arms thrust through holes in the blanket, to that when Chatterton perished in his pride, and, it may be feared, also in his folly, belong the scenes, real or supposed, which Macaulay has dashed off in one of his most brilliant and famous passages, and which, before and after him, others have depicted in their own way and with their own success or non-success.

Grub  
Street.

A sketch of literature written in connection with Social History cannot afford to pass Grub Street; and we may as well deal with it *in limine*. Nor shall I beat much about the bush before announcing that though not much given to paradoxical new views, or to the rather childish practice of differing with my betters for the sake of difference, I regard Grub Street with a good deal of suspicion. A few of its houses may have been built on solid ground; but I think it went off into cloudland. In other words, I regard the Macaulayan picture of the almost

necessary and regular woes and hardships of mid-century men of letters with a great deal of scepticism. The stock instances, the awful examples, are open to very considerable demur. Savage, Boyse, and Chatterton are the three usually quoted victims. Now Chatterton's case was so altogether exceptional that it might have happened at almost any time; Savage was, at the best, a very minor poet who had the luck to have a man of genius for comrade and panegyrist, at the worst a Bohemian Mohock who must have come to grief in almost any circumstances; Boyse was such a scoundrel that his own legend accuses him of sharing the profits of his wife's dishonour, and such a *fainéant* that he lost a good appointment because it rained on the morning when he was to have presented his letters of recommendation. You can draw no inference from instances such as these—of persons who poison themselves as mere children after a huge piece of forgery, or of persons who would have starved, in the very paradise of the six-shilling novel, from sheer vicious folly.

But, it is said, Fielding, Collins, Johnson, Goldsmith were all persons of undoubted genius; though some of them had foibles. they had nothing worse than foibles, and all of them were either arrested, or in danger of arrest, for debt. Again let us examine a little. Collins, whose period of probation was but a short one, had presented himself to the public with the tiniest possible pamphlet of no doubt remarkable verses. I know there is a vague idea that the poet ought instantly to be fed with turtle from gold spoons by a grateful public, and perhaps he ought; but it is quite certain that if John Milton in the seventeenth century, or Alfred Tennyson in the nineteenth, had attempted to live and pay bills on the profits of "L'Allegro" and "The Palace of Art," neither would have been treated by their times better than Collins was. Fielding's unthrift may have been exaggerated; but he certainly had a talent for getting through money, and when he took to his proper vocation he received, as a totally unknown novelist, the not absolute pittance of £150, and then the very considerable sum of £600 for his second venture. Johnson threw himself upon London without money, without introductions, without even a degree, and though with much vague learning, yet with no special "line" or aptitude; while it must also be remembered that Johnson was admittedly

had, if he did not go mad like Collins and Smart, a much worse chance in the middle of the eighteenth century than at any other time, is a thing which I at least must for the present regard as Not Quite Proven.

Samuel  
Johnson.

Next to the supposed existence of Grub Street, the undoubted existence of its most famous denizen, the Great Lexicographer, must claim special notice. The career of Johnson, the material facts of which are, thanks to Boswell, and to the commentators on Boswell, too well known to need any recapitulation here, began indeed a little before our anterior limit; for he had brought out his first poem and had been complimented by Pope (who also tried to assist him) as early as 1738. But the years immediately succeeding were occupied by drudgery for Cave; and it was not till 1744 that Johnson's first independent prose work—the extremely partial but very agreeable “Life of Savage”—appeared. He died forty years later—the forty years of our present period. The earlier part of this long stretch is, by common consent, as little known as the later—when James Boswell had been sent from Heaven and Scotland to be his chronicler—is well known; and it is still a somewhat unexplained marvel how Johnson—penniless, something of a hermit, with no great friends, and with literary performances which, though never contemptible, were never exactly great—should have climbed or slipped into the position which he always more or less held for at least three of these four decades.

His Liter-  
ary Life.

The first of the four saw the announcement and the completion, under difficulties (though the appearance was a little postponed), of the “Dictionary,” with, in 1749, the memorable, if not quite gigantic, item of the “Vanity of Human Wishes” (an enormous advance on “London”); the qualified success of the worthless tragedy of *Irene*, in the same year; the interesting periodical attempts in Addisonian vein of *The Rambler*, which he wrote almost entirely between 1750 and 1752, and *The Adventurer*, in which he supplied Hawkesworth with some score and a half of numbers.


The second decade almost opened with the “Dictionary,” which appeared in the spring of 1755, and with that famous snubbing letter to Chesterfield, which is certainly a very fine piece of English prose, but which has, perhaps, had quite sufficient admiration from critics and historians. Chesterfield's

civility may have been rather empty and belated, but it hardly needed such a ninety-gun-ship broadside as this to blow a cock-boat out of the water; there is no evidence that the much-abused author of the "Letters" had ever disappointed any reasonable hopes of Johnson's; and it may possibly seem to some incorrigible Advocates of the Devil that so solemn a remonstrance with a patron argues a rather undue readiness to take it for granted that a patron is bound to play Providence.

But this may pass. Between 1758 and 1760 appeared *The Idler*, a series of papers not independently published, which is, as a whole, superior to *The Rambler*. "Rasselas" appeared during the interval in 1759; and then, with the exception of the much later and much greater "Lives of the Poets," Johnson's purely literary work was done. His troubles were done likewise. He had always been a Tory, and though he had been also something of a Jacobite, the sort of eirenicon accepted between kingsmen of all kinds at the time made it not in the least improper for him to take a pension from George III. It would have been better if he had never undertaken his "Shakespeare," which he delayed so long that there were accusations (rather juster than those about the pension) of bad faith with the subscribers, and which he did but ill at last. But in 1763 he was introduced to his fated biographer, Boswell, and next year "The Club" came into being.

For nearly thirty years Johnson had been in quest of a vocation and a livelihood; for more than twenty others he had found the latter, but had been rather insufficiently provided with the former. Yet another twenty remained to him, during which, except for perpetual ill health and loneliness (for his wife, the famous Tetty, was now some time dead), he lived his life very nearly as much according to his own special way and choice as any man of letters of whom history gives record. His last house, that in Bolt Court, though not fashionable or splendid, appears to have been comfortable and decently equipped; the queer group of dependents he got together in it were his own choice, and not forced on him by a reluctantly accepted relationship, or, worse still, an ill-assorted marriage; he had society of every sort that he cared for, and ruled all societies in which he appeared. Between 1770 and 1775 he wrote four political pamphlets, the best known of which by title—none of them can

be said to be well known in contents—was “Taxation no Tyranny,” exposing with unanswerable logic and historical accuracy, but with a somewhat insufficient attention to time and circumstance, the groundlessness of the American rebellion. In 1773 Boswell took him to Scotland—a famous journey,



DR. JOHNSON'S HOUSE, BOLT COURT.

(Now demolished.)

whereof the travellers have left two famous accounts. He became an LL.D. in 1775, and two years later he began the “Lives of the Poets.” His very last years were saddened by ever-increasing ill-health, and by fits of the terrible depression which pursued him through life, as well as by what he thought the unkindness of Mrs. Thrale, whose house at Streatham, during her husband's life, had been his favourite resort, and on whom, after that husband's death and in her quest for another, Johnson seems to have become a burden. But he had many other faithful allies, from Edmund Burke to Fanny


Burney; and when he died on December 13th, 1784, certainly not the unluckiest, though as certainly not the least great, of Englishmen passed away. The unkindness of the Fates to him has, perhaps, sometimes been exaggerated; the kindness of the Muses not so.

**Johnson's  
Work and  
Character.**

Yet all competent critics—and he has occupied the most competent—have found it not merely necessary to admit that the man was greater than his works, but not specially easy to indicate the special character of his human greatness. After much undue praise and some exaggerated depreciation of the work itself, the best judges are agreed to consider it, with the possible exception of the “Lives of the Poets,” eminently

second-rate. The "Lives of the Poets," strangely far from the centre as some of the judgments go, are not second rate; but they did not obtain for Johnson his fame in his own day, and it may be suspected that they profited even more by that fame than they helped to make it. By the time when he wrote them, Johnson, never disposed to extreme humility except as a matter of religious conviction, could speak with authority as hardly Dryden, hardly Pope, hardly his namesake a hundred and fifty years earlier could have spoken: and authority is a great thing in giving judgment. A junior barrister may be quite as clever and almost as good a lawyer as a Lord Chief Justice, but he will never give judgment with such weight. But, it must be added (and it is specially important here), to Johnson's credit, that he had the real judicial qualities, and, at the same time, he was eminently of his time. What he knew not was sometimes very specially worth knowing; but his time did not think so. What he knew was what his time thought best worth knowing.

And, further, for all his whim, for all his prejudice, for all his common (and exceedingly bad) habit of "talking for victory," he had this eminently judicial mind at a time when no quality of human nature was better cultivated than judgment. In mere knowledge he might sometimes go wrong; in mere taste, frequently; in crotchet, perpetually. But he was perfectly honest; there was not an atom or a shred of cant in him; his moral nature in his best moments was of the noblest, the kindest, the sanest ever known or even conceivable. We are sometimes told that his greatness is the creation of Boswell. His own age, the age of Burke and Gibbon, was neither foolish nor credulous; it had not read Boswell, and it made no mistake about Johnson. He is not the greatest or the most universal of our men of letters, but he is by far the most English: and very little shame



JAMES BOSWELL, BY SIR JOSHUA REYNOLDS.

(National Gallery.)



need we take to ourselves so long as we can point to him as our literary embodiment, if not exactly our literary exemplar or masterpiece.

**The  
Novelists.**

But the personality of Johnson is not more dominant among the personalities of this time than the kind or species of the novel is dominant among the kinds of its production. Industrious persons have been able to show that long before the middle of the century the production of novels in England was very large. But unless anyone be so curiously minded as to call "Gulliver" a novel, nobody but Defoe had devoted genius to prose fiction, and Defoe's performances came from nothing and led to nothing. The four great novelists of the mid-eighteenth century were themselves immediately preceded by no one, and followed by very few in their own kind; but they present a distinct, a permanent, and a necessary development in the general history of prose fiction. Before them there existed the romance; there existed, as produced by Madame de La Fayette and her followers in France, the *noveau roman*; but there did not exist—though Marivaux, if he had been less indolent, might have furnished it—the novel.

They were of very different ages, but the earliest performances of the three of them who come closest together (Sterne is a kind of outsider) coincided very nearly in time, and, indeed, were pretty certainly the result, not exactly of imitation, but of example, exciting original genius and talent. "Pamela" appeared in 1740: "Joseph Andrews," its parody, though vastly more than its parody, in 1742; "Roderick Random" in 1748. But Richardson had been born as early as 1688, though he did not die till 1763; Fielding's birth-year was 1707 (he died in 1754); and Smollett was fourteen years younger than Fielding (whom he outlived by seventeen) and more than thirty years younger than Richardson. Sterne (1713–68) came between Fielding and Smollett, but the long period of contented idleness which he spent on his Yorkshire livings threw him behind all of them in publication; and it was not till 1760 that "Tristram Shandy" came as a New Year's gift to a half-puzzled and half-delighted world. Each of these men had such strong and distinct natural gifts that it is almost unbelievable that any one of them should have died without giving something to the public; yet each of them in turn was apparently indebted to his forerunners for at

least suggestion, and it is not fanciful to suppose that there was something abroad, some spirit of earth or air, which affected them all. However this may be, in the course of the thirty years from "Pamela" to "Humphry Clinker" they gave to the department of English literature which had hitherto been one of the poorest in numbers or quantity of production, nearly, if not



*Photo: Walker & Cochrill.*

SAMUEL RICHARDSON, BY JOSEPH HIGHMORE.

*(National Portrait Gallery.)*

quite, the poorest in public estimation, and—except for the work of Bunyan, Defoe, and Swift—absolutely the poorest in literary merit, a rank which enabled it positively to look down upon all its own contemporaries, and secured it a respectable position for all time.

There was much other novel-writing in their day—some of it by no means contemptible, some of it deserving of the fullest and most sovereign contempt. But the better work—the

charming fantasy of "Peter Wilkins," the quaint and genial absurdity of "John Bunce," the estimable performances of Sarah Fielding, Henry's sister, and of Charlotte Lennox—are not characteristic but exceptional, and not extraordinarily noteworthy as exceptions; while as for the novel-garbage of the time—dull or dirty, trivial or pompous—novel-garbage is much the same at all times, and at no time calls for anything but a squeegee and a scavenger. Even in regard to the great works just mentioned this is not the place for individual criticism. We can say, in general, that Richardson, besides for the first time subordinating mere adventure (though he still had to give something of that) to the full delineation of character and the elaborate representation of common life, succeeded for the first time also in English prose fiction in stealing from the stage the peculiar appeal of dramatic interest, and exercising upon his readers something like the traditional purgation by pity and terror which is supposed to belong to tragedy, with touches even of the satiric criticism of life and manners which comedy claims as her own. We can add that Fielding, taking (it can hardly be said borrowing) the same conception of the novel, further informed and inspirited it with a gigantic and wonderful humour: shook out of it the morbidness on one side and the meticulous minuteness on the other, which are the great drawbacks of Richardson's method: impressed upon it a stamp of completeness, of thorough humanity, which no novelist has ever improved upon, while few have equalled it; and, lastly, gave to fiction a constructive architecture, a thoroughly engineered scheme, unsurpassed in regularity and art by any other kind. We can point out that Smollett, retrograding a little in this matter of construction, in the strict general humanity of his types, and in the height and range of his humorous criticism of life, introduced a vast number of diverting oddities and humours, and blended once more the older and more varied, if more superficial, interest of incident and adventure with the newer one of character and manners. Lastly, we may show Sterne, like the farce of the great tetralogy, attempting and achieving a mainly fantastic kind, in which the chief distinguishing attribute of all the four—their truth in this way and that, on this or that scheme, to life—is not less apparent than in the others, for all the fantasticalities. With this great science or art of presenting life Richardson deals as a cabalist or

Richardson.

Fielding.

Smollett.

me.

scholastic, Fielding as a consummate artist-scholar, Smollett as a lusty writer of comedy that does not disdain to drop into farce, Sterne as a half-Rabelaisian, half-sentimental fantast.



HENRY FIELDING (AFTER W. HOGARTH).  
(From Murphy's edition of Fielding's works. 1772.)

But all are in their several ways true to it; and all expound it in a way which had been hitherto thought the province of the poet alone.

From our special point of view, moreover, there is an interest

Their  
Works and  
Real Life.


in these men and their work which is positively new. Hitherto we have had to construct the life and the men of the times by a more or less laborious process. The historian has not, up to this time, condescended to give us more than scraps of information; the satirist, valuable in his way, is not so much suspected as convicted of exaggeration; the dramatist not so much believed as known to be guilty of it likewise. That there is some exaggeration in Richardson and Fielding, much in Sterne and Smollett is, of course, not so much probable as certain. You might have had to go a long way (*cir.* 1750) before finding an exact Squire Western or an exact Sir Stentor Stile; perhaps Parson Trulliber was a little furbished and ornamented: certainly it cannot have been the absolute rule that no young lady of features or fortune rather above the common could venture from home without a squadron of horse and a gang of Bow Street runners to protect her from violent or fraudulent abduction. But the kind of exaggeration is different; the sense of fidelity, the "eye on the object" has come to the novelist. And accordingly the ineffable, the inexplicable sense of confidence comes to his readers. Even in Richardson the most over-studied, in Smollett the most deliberately humorous, in Sterne the most confessedly fantastic, we feel that the general scheme and *décor*, the "habit as it lived" of the time is true and real; while as for Fielding he is more than an Enchanter Faustus for us. There may have been scenes and sides of life in the mid-eighteenth century that he did not depict—nay, there certainly were such. But whatsoever and whomsoever he has depicted, we know that that thing and that person, allowing the mere touches necessary for art, did so exist that we need be under no doubt about them, that the evidence is better than the preamble of any Act of Parliament.

Poetry.

This is not the criticism which can be passed on the poetical as distinguished from the prose "making" of the period. Attempts have recently been made by various persons and from various points of view to mitigate the anathemas which were passed on eighteenth-century poetry in the first burst of the Romantic movement, and during the greater part of the earlier half of this century. These attempts have often been characterised by ingenuity, and have sometimes been not devoid of force. But, taking the most catholic view possible, making

1784]

every allowance that can be made, what is to be said of a period which for forty years, between the death of Pope and the rise of the quartette above mentioned, contributes nothing that by the utmost stretch of charity can be deemed real poetry of anything like the first class, except the best work of Gray and Collins, the recently revived masterpiece (itself owing as much to madness as to great wits) of Kit Smart, a little of Shenstone,



LAURENCE STERNE, BY GAINSBOROUGH.

(*The Royal Museum and Art Galleries, Salford.*)

some flashes of Akenside and Mason, and a few more of other persons? Put it all together, and it would make but a small volume; take its utterances at their very best, and I at least cannot admit that it contains poetry equal to that which can be found in the work of such imperfect real poets as Blake or Donne.

Yet it is very interesting, and looked at impartially it is much more interesting, as it seems to me, not merely than its decriers would admit, but than its well-meaning but excessive

merit. Indeed, even the poetasters of this period, or such persons as Byrom of Manchester, whom it would be unfair to call poetasters, though they cannot be called poets, are frequently excellent at this. But Shenstone, the most home-keeping of men, despite his love for inns, is in poetry all abroad. He does not know where he is; he does not know what he would be at, and he achieves *rococo* and *pastiche* because he will not be merely conventional in the ordinary way.

Collins.


Of Collins it is rather dangerous to speak, for very serious anathemas have been pronounced on anyone who will not avouch Collins to be a poet, a whole poet, and nothing but a poet. But any critic who is worth his critical salt is proof against all anathemas, except his own. Collins was born in 1721; he died at the age of thirty-eight; he had been infirm in mind for ten years earlier, and we have no work of his dating from these ten years. The handful of odes which he had written before his malady would not, if printed in the ordinary fashion of new poetry, fill a hundred pages of twenty lines each. They include charming things—the famous “Passions,” the exquisite “Dirge in Cymbeline,” the beautiful “Lines on Thomson’s Grave,” and others. But the poet is singing in fetters—the fetters not of his madness but of his convention. Johnson, a good and true friend of Collins, and though an untrustworthy critic of purely romantic poetry, likely to be conciliated rather than revolted by the classical form of the odes, broke the truth bluntly when he said that Collins’s inversion of phrase savoured of the mistake that “if you do not write prose you will write poetry.” In no true poet known to me, not in Rossetti, not in Donne, is the drawback of artificial poetic diction so obnoxious as in Collins. And the reason is clear. He *was* a true poet, a poet of the truest, who, unluckily for him, was singing in the spirit of one age with the tongue of another. He is trying to say Shibboleth, but he cannot; and though he says Sibboleth with exquisite grace, it is Sibboleth still.

Gray.

Gray had (except in pure poetic gift, wherein he was probably inferior) many advantages over Collins. He was quite sane; he was brought up in the best society; he never had any pecuniary difficulties; he lived comfortably if not merrily at Cambridge for the best part of his life of fifty-five years (1716–71), and he became a master of ancient and modern learning. He, too, had

1784]

the true Romantic feeling, and he indulged it. But the cursed spite of his birth-year still refused him the Romantic organ, and he is in the twilight. He has left exceedingly little; the truth being, as I at least have no doubt, that he early found the hopeless divorce between his desires of conception and his powers of expression. What he has left, though not so exquisite as Collins, suffers a little less from the war between the law within and the law without; but as there is less internal genius, it is



THOMAS GRAY, BY BENJAMIN WILSON.

(Pembroke College, Cambridge.)

less interesting. The great "Elegy" is fine, no doubt, but the curse of Lamartine is on it; it is tepid, Laodicean, neither this nor that. Gray's great learning and his fine taste saved him, in "The Bard" and "The Fatal Sisters," from the tawdry *pastiche* of Macpherson and the juvenile immaturity of Chatterton. But still, blasphemy as it may seem, I do not know that he is not at his best in purely light verse—like the epitaph of the pensive Selima, and the "Long Story"—a style where all his century is good, and in which delightful things may be found in unread pages of Smart and Whitehead.



Percy's "Reliques of English Poetry," the publication of which in 1765 may be said to have dealt a fatal, though not an immediately fatal, blow, both to the classical and the semi-classical schools, may also be said to account for a certain wall of partition which stands between the poets just mentioned on the one hand, and Goldsmith and Chatterton on the other. Although Goldsmith was born as early as 1728, he did not write, or at least publish, at all early; and his "Traveller" did




Photo: Chester Vaughan, Acton, W.

STOKE POGES CHURCHYARD.

not appear till 1764 (nominally next year), his "Vicar of Wakefield" till 1766, his "Deserted Village" till 1770, and *She Stoops to Conquer* till 1773. Next year Goldsmith died, leaving, besides the famous things just mentioned, a mass of agreeable hack-work and some charming literature—the light poems of "Retaliation," the "Haunch of Venison," and others, the exquisite half-Addisonian, half-French essays of the "Citizen of the World," and the "Bee," etc. Some surprise may be felt at Goldsmith being classed with Chatterton as a post-Reliques man: but let us explain. In all considerable revolutions, political, literary, and other, the effect is two-fold. Some of

the brighter spirits are thrown into violent revolt, and others (fewer generally but not less bright) into stiff reaction. Goldsmith was here the reactionary. Not only had he no critical head—his criticism of literature is usually as weak as his criticism of life is consummate; not only was he in all probability quite disposed to let his great friend the other Doctor



*Photo: Corke, Sez.noals.*

OLIVER GOLDSMITH, BY SIR JOSHUA REYNOLDS.

*(By permission of the Right Hon. Lord Sackville.)*

(whom he regarded with a little not unjustified jealousy and a great deal of affectionate esteem) do his critical thinking for him; but though a charming writer of verse, he had little strictly poetical temperament. So he sneered at the new studies of old poets, carefully eschewed them himself, and is, in form and spirit, a strict "know-nothing" of the school of Pope.

It cannot quite be said that Chatterton is an equally strict

Chatter-  
ton.

know-nothing on the other side. Among the mass of precocious verse which the poor child left, there is a good deal which is not distinguishable from the ordinary verse of the versifiers of the time. But the work which has given him fame, and the positive value whereof is still rather a moot matter, was at the opposite pole. He was not directly inspired by Percy; for his famous "Rowley" imitations began in his twelfth year, 1764, before the "Reliques" appeared. It was thus a clear instance of the influence "in the air." How he multiplied these attempts, how he duped some ignorant and some not quite ignorant folk, how he had some success with newspapers, and even got a short play acted, how from April to August, 1770, he fought an unequal fight in London, and giving it up too hurriedly poisoned himself in Brook Street, Holborn, while he yet wanted three months of his nineteenth year—is known from a hundred histories and articles, plays and poems on the subject. That his imitations of the antique should ever have been taken for genuine merely shows that his contemporaries were more ignorant than he was, and that at the same time they shared his interest in the medieval. There is more matter for debate in the positive value of his work, but it is not suitable for debate here. It is enough to say that when it is proved that anything more than promise is to be expected from seventeen, it will become more necessary than it is to inquire whether there is more than promise in Chatterton.

The  
Drama.

Of his fellow-witness—like him an unwilling one—to the almost indiscriminate appetite of the age for anything that was not modern, not clear, not correct, not prosaic—of "Ossian" Macpherson—enough has been said, and we must pass lightly over Churchill, a rather worthless man, and not a very worthy satirist, who died young, and whose true value (often overlooked) consists in his having reverted in decasyllabic practice to the model of Dryden rather than that of Pope, and having taught this to his very dissimilar schoolfellow Cowper. But the mention just made of *She Stoops to Conquer* may lead us from the poets to the playwrights, who are very interesting just here. It is more easy to devise than to approve explanations of the sudden brilliancy of playwriting in the eighth decade of the century. The acting of Garrick will not suffice;

1784!

for Garrick had been acting long before. And though it might account for the activity and the success of respectable playwrights like Colman and Cumberland, Murphy and Mrs. Cowley, it will not account for Goldsmith and Sheridan, especially for the latter. *She Stoops to Conquer*, admirable as it is, and still more the earlier *Goodnatured Man*, have, perhaps, more novel interest and literary merit than strictly dramatic genius. But *The School for Scandal* and *The Critic*, *The Rivals*, and even *The Duenna*, are plays pure and simple, and plays of a quality not merely delightful but great — the first three certainly great in their own kind. Croker and Tony Lumpkin would have been as much at home in prose narrative. But Puff, and Sir Anthony, and Joseph Surface, delightful as they are to read, are born of the boards, and only there on their native soil. That these fifteen or twenty years should have produced plays such as had not been seen for more than sixty years before, and, as some say, have not been seen for at least sixty years since, is something of a problem, explicable perhaps by fanciful and fatalist theory, less so by any sober demonstration of reason and fact.



Photo: Waller &amp; Cockerell.

RIGHT HON. RICHARD BRINSLEY SHERIDAN,  
M.P., BY J. RUSSELL, R.A.

(National Portrait Gallery.)

Less enigmatical, though to others than serious students perhaps less interesting, certainly less episodic and unconnected with things before and after, is the rise of the English historical school, which dates from our period, and which, if generosity and want of space did not prescribe the leaving of Gibbon (whose mighty work was half done in it) to the next, might

Sheridan.

History

be said to have attained its full, though far from its final, perfection at this time. We were late with our great historians in England; but there was not, as in the other department of novel writing, an almost absolute absence of forerunners. The Elizabethan and Jacobean times had given us some worthy chroniclers, a splendid if unequal master of historical style in Raleigh, a scholarly and competent historian proper in Knolles. The period of the Civil Wars had, half by accident, given us the great genius of Clarendon in historical portraiture if not in history. But thereafter for a considerable time there was nothing; and we left to refugees like Rapin, or discharged ourselves, by respectable but hopeless persons like Carte and Harte, the duty of recounting the great argument of English and other history.

There would be little profit in the endeavour to show by fanciful argument (which would be, as in the last case, as easy as it would be fanciful) why the want was supplied, to appearance all of a sudden, by David Hume (1711-76), and by his compatriot and ten years junior, William Robertson (1721-93). The accumulation of historical material, the great example of the French Benedictines as masters of research, and of the French historians from Mézeray onwards in matter of compilation, necessitated an attempt at synthetic history; while the instance of Conyers Middleton in his "Life of Cicero" was probably not without weight. That both Hume and Robertson were Scotchmen, who wrote with elaborate pains a sort of literary dialect rather than a vernacular, is probably a mere accident, not requiring anything more than indication.

Hume.

It is much more to our purpose that they did, as a matter of fact, set the example of the popular literary history, and that this example was immediately followed and never let go. Hume's greatest work (p. 321) was not historical, and it falls out of our purview in this particular place; but his "History" would have been great enough. It still remains, unfortunately, the one example of a "History of England" on the great scale, written with a combination of intellectual grasp and literary style altogether above the average. The old accusations against its partisanship are ridiculous. Hume's Toryism did not lead him nearly so far from absolute impartiality as Lingard's Popery," as Macaulay's Whiggishness, as Mr. Green's neo-

Liberalism ; and he compensated it by a sort of transcendence of humour which, unfortunately, none of these three shared. Much more serious defects, the first more or less unavoidable, the second the taint of the time, were the incompleteness of his information, and the rather cavalier fashion in which he treated what information he had. But it may be doubted whether his mastery of a sort—and a very excellent sort—of style did not compensate even for these.

Robertson, in comparison with Hume, had the disadvantage of less genius, and the advantage of a more single-minded devotion to the Historic Muse. His "History of Scotland" in 1758, and his "History of Charles V." eleven years later, brought him much fame, much money, a position rarely equalled ; and he deserved all of these. For if these historians rather shock our modern prudery by neglecting "document" and detail, they have over most of their successors (not Gibbon) the enormous advantage of not being blinded to the wood by the trees. They could take, and they did take, connected views ; and these views, whatever small criticisms may be made on them by Dryasdust, were not merely often, but usually, of no ordinary truth and range.

Robert-  
son.

How this truth and range met (and some would say parted) once and for all with Gibbon, is not for us to tell. The limits assigned to this section already approach, and all the space that is left would hardly suffice to do the most summary justice to one who is, all things told and all things allowed for, the greatest historian of the world. Yet he was a typical man of this special time in his defects, if not in his merits ; the incubation, the inception, and all but the finish of the "Decline and Fall" belong to this chapter ; and the glory of him falls at least as much here as elsewhere, if not more.

Gibbon.

Not quite so much can be said of Burke, for Burke's most splendid and monumental work—that in which he stemmed, and, more than anyone who wielded the pen, turned the tide of the French Revolution—is far ahead of us ; while the placid talent of Reynolds, with its beginning of serious and accomplished writing on Art in England, can be postponed easily and with much propriety. But the period warns us of its approach to our own day by abounding with persons not epoch-making, not intrinsically great, but good enough to make the

Miscel-  
laneous.


chronicler in however small a room rather reluctant to abandon them to utter oblivion. The Wesleys were great hymn-writers, and Charles, the younger (1708-78), was not a very small poet. In fiction the "Chrysal" of the almost unknown Charles Johnstone, an imitation of Smollett, which is the *locus classicus* for the unholy revels of Medmenham; Brooke's eccentric "Fool of Quality," a good book for an inn on a rainy afternoon, as the writer read it; and even the first work of Mackenzie, "The Man of Feeling," the author of which is familiar to us nearly sixty years later in Lockhart's "Scott"—deserve at least mention. Anstey's "New Bath Guide" (1776), in a style which is neither poetical nor prosaic, had an influence on future light verse to which at least sufficient justice has been done, and may be granted by the sternest critics the honour of having summed up and passed on the fleeting aptitudes of the century for such verse which have been already noticed. But without attempting to sweep into the net more persons of this kind, we must finish with a notice of the hitherto unnoticed Miscellanists, the precursors of the periodical and newspaper writing of later days.

#### Essayists.

The Essayists of the Addison tradition continued, and were, as has been seen, graced by the adhesion of men like Johnson and Goldsmith. But in this kind of writing the most notable examples were two men of rank who, like Congreve, would have pretended a wish to be considered only as gentlemen, but who were—the one not indifferent to, the other feverishly though covertly—ambitious of the favour of the Muses. One of them was Philip, Earl of Chesterfield; the other was Horace, who ended his life as an equally authentic Earl of Orford, but of whom, in this case not against his wish, one never speaks or thinks but as Horace Walpole.

Both were men essentially, and to an extraordinary degree, of their time; and as the one was nearly five-and-twenty years the junior of the other, they give us, in a manner not easily to be paralleled elsewhere, the eighteenth century as it showed itself, during almost its whole course, in persons of high rank, of complete education, and of very exceptional ability. Both were long-lived: Chesterfield, who was born in 1694, did not die till 1773, and Horace Walpole, who was born in 1717, after about the same complete span of life, died in 1797. Chesterfield,

a statesman and a courtier, belonged rather to the age of patronage than that of performance, and rather to that of sterile correctness than to that of romantic quest. But his famous letters to his illegitimate son, his few "Characters," and his fewer verses show a man of extraordinary intellectual capacity, who might have done almost anything, and did do not a little. Walpole, a younger son and a man of little political



PHILIP, EARL OF CHESTERFIELD, BY THOMAS HUDSON.  
(By permission of His Grace the Duke of Fife.)

and no statesmanlike ability, a virtuoso, a dilettante, an early if not altogether instructed convert to Gothic architecture and Renaissance bric-à-brac, to medieval romance and to modern collecting, exhibits an entirely different and later stage of *ton*. Neither published very much; but while Chesterfield published hardly anything (the "Letters" were issued after his death by his daughter-in-law), Horace Walpole, who possessed a private press, did not a little. His fame, however, does not rest on his



Letters  
and  
Memoirs.

"Royal and Noble Authors," nor on his "Mysterious Mother," nor even on his "Castle of Otranto," interesting as this is in the history of British fiction; but on his copious, various, and delightful letters, never yet collected in full, but always, in whatever collection, welcome. "Lady Mary"—i.e. Lady Mary Wortley Montagu—and Lord Hervey earlier had done something to set England not too far behind France in matter of Letters and Memoirs. Chesterfield did, perhaps, more still. But Walpole did most of all. The title of coxcomb, which has been scornfully awarded and indignantly repudiated, is too surely his; he had the faults to which those born on the fringe of the purple, as he was, are more liable than those born in the purple itself; he was (chiefly through wilfulness) a bad critic of other men's work, and for this or other reasons not too good a one of his own. But his work is delightful as literature and invaluable as history. Taken with Boswell's "Johnson," it supplies almost a complete view of the intellectual, social, and literary life of this period, certainly an indispensable companion to the due enjoyment and the due understanding of the "Ode on the Passions" and the "Elegy in a Country Churchyard," of "Tom Jones" and "Clarissa," and "Humphry Clinker" and "Tristram Shandy," of the "Rambler" and the "Decline and Fall," of *She Stoops to Conquer* and *The School for Scandal*.

REGINALD  
HUGHES.  
The Re-  
generation  
of Art.

THE accession of George II. may be said to mark the dark hour that precedes the dawn. In 1727, the year of his accession, Hogarth, though only known as an ingenious designer, was twenty-nine; Richard Wilson was a boy of thirteen. Reynolds was a child of four, and Francis Cotes was two years old. Gainsborough was an infant in arms; Romney and Wright of Derby came a few years later. But the Court was not much less a foreign Court under George II. than it had been under his father. Neither cared a jot for art, and viewed with equal indifference the claims of the foreign and the native artist. Nevertheless, there was a marked impulse in the direction of art connoisseurship—not always, perhaps, according to knowledge—under George II. In 1734 the Dilettanti Society was established by a group of "five gentlemen," who, having travelled in Italy, were "desirous of encouraging at home a

Signs of  
a New  
Era.

[1784]

taste for those objects which had contributed so much to their entertainment abroad." Of course, in 1734, no stigma attached to the name by which these gentlemen dubbed their society. Many of them were expert virtuosi, some men of real science.



MEMBERS OF THE DILETTANTI SOCIETY, BY SIR JOSHUA REYNOLDS.  
(By permission of the Dilettanti Society.)

They organised expeditions for archæological research, published travels in the countries where art formerly flourished, established art studentships, and generally fulfilled the functions of a committee of taste. In this they were supported by the Society of Arts, founded nineteen years later, and somewhat more utilitarian in its aims. Both societies established prizes for

competition among artists, and lent their rooms for exhibitions, and extended to art and artists a patronage which, if not always enlightened, was consistent and sincere. If the Court was not munificent in its dealings with artists of native birth, it was not more so with the immigrants from abroad, though some foreigners of distinction, like Leotard and Canaletti, made England for a time their home. Jervas and Richardson and Hayman the scene-painter were, at first, the leading spirits in the world of Art. They were succeeded by Thomas Hudson, who, until the rise of Reynolds, was the fashionable painter of England. His *chef d'œuvre*, such as it is, was the family group he executed for Charles, Duke of Marlborough; but as he did not paint it until the sixth decade of the century, he probably had by that time learned something from the younger generation which he affected to despise. The knowledge and insight of this most successful painter may be fitly gauged by his contempt for his pupil Reynolds, whom he characterised as an artist "who will never distinguish himself." As a rule, our indigenous painters in the early years of George II. deserve the oblivion into which they have fallen. Always, of course, excepting Hogarth, whose genius fills the stage until the entrance of Reynolds and his contemporaries.

Hudson.

Hogarth.  
His Work.

Probably no great artist had so curiously limited a gift as Hogarth. Without any feeling for the highest qualities of beauty, indifferent to the subtle attractions of colour and modelling, without a scrap of poetry in his composition, he did, perhaps, more for the art of his country than any other Englishman before or since. He found English art a mass of insincerity and affectation, without honesty of purpose, without nobility of aim, and unredeemed by fine qualities of hand. He brought truth into the studio and drove imposture out. He taught the world that the men and women of the Georgian era were, after all, more worthy of representation than the creations of a sham mythology, and that the tragedy of daily existence offered finer subjects for the pencil than the fictitious woes of gods and shepherdesses. Even Beer Street and Gin Lane in London better served the artist's purpose than a Frenchified and salacious Arcadia.

Hogarth was born in Bartholomew Close on the 10th of November, 1697. His father, though the son of a poor West-





1784]

moreland farmer, was a man of some education, and made a shift to live partly as a corrector of the press, partly as a Grub Street author. By his own desire, his son William was apprenticed to Gamble, a silver-plate engraver in Cranbourne Alley. Soon he began to draw on the copper, and his earliest work after serving his apprenticeship was his own business card, "W. Hogarth, engraver. Aprill ye 23rd, 1720." From business cards and bill-heads he passed to plates and satirical designs, and thence to illustrations of books like the travels of "Aubry de la Motraye" and Briscoe's "Apuleius." These are not yet characteristic, but in 1724 he published the "Taste of the Town," ridiculing the fashionable Jack of all trades, William Kent. This seems to have been the first print he published on his own account. It was followed by his caricature of Kent's Altar-piece, and the illustrations to "Hudibras." These last, though founded on the work of another, contain much coarse and vivid humour, the product of Hogarth's brain, and, indeed, are thoroughly "Hogarthian." As the rivalry of Kent and Thornhill was then very bitter, the attacks on the former brought Hogarth into favour with Thornhill, who admitted him to his studio, and gave him instructions in oil-painting. He commenced to paint family groups—small conversation pieces, as he calls them—a class of subject in which he acquired considerable skill. In 1729 he ran away with Thornhill's daughter, but the estrangement between the families was so far from serious that Lady Thornhill was suspected of connivance. Soon after his marriage he began the first of the two "Progresses" which have immortalised his name. It is characteristic of the coarseness of the man and of the age that he should have selected such a subject as "The Harlot's Progress" at such a moment. This series of six pictures is a microcosm of Hogarth's art—an art incomparably ingenious in narration, piquant and unflagging in interest, and entirely dramatic. But there is not one spark of tenderness in "The Harlot's Progress" from end to end. The country girl, picked up by the procuress in the first picture, deserves her fate, according to Hogarth, as she passes through the rank good fortune of the Jew's mistress to Bridewell and hard labour, "to disease and death, to a shameful funeral and a forgotten grave." In the very last act of all

The  
"Harl  
Progr

The  
"Rake's  
Progress."

the artist is unrelenting. There is no mourning for the harlot. Even her child is not impressed; he winds up his top in the foreground—"the only thing in that assembly," says Elia, "that is not a hypocrite." Absence of tenderness is still more visible in the subsequent series, "The Rake's Progress." In these pictures, almost for the first and last time, there is an attempt at pathos. The girl that Tom Rakewell has seduced is introduced several times. In the first picture he casts her off; in the fourth she offers him her purse to pay the debt for which he is arrested. In the seventh and last of the scenes she tries to comfort her seducer, now an incurable maniac in Bedlam. But in all these cases the sentimental or pathetic motive is handled without any real sympathy, and without a trace of the vigour and ingenuity with which he emphasises the more repulsive incidents. It must be remembered, in judging of these works as pictures, that both series were painted with the view of their reproduction as prints, for it is as a *peintre-graveur*, and not otherwise, that Hogarth must be judged.

Hogarth  
and Copy-  
right

But between the dates of issue of "The Harlot's Progress" and "The Rake's Progress" Hogarth contrived to lay the foundation of the English law of copyright in design. In concert with George Virtue and others interested in engraving, he petitioned Parliament for an Act to vest in the designer the exclusive copyright in his works. Their prayer was granted in the Bill which received the Royal Assent on the 15th of May, 1735, just in time to enable the series of "The Rake's Progress" to get the protection of the Act. Before his death Hogarth was able to write that he had thus "made prints a considerable article of commerce of this country, there being now more business of this kind done here than in Paris, or anywhere else, and as well." Unquestionably Hogarth had now found his true vocation, though he hankered always after "the great style of history painting," a style in which he was quite unfitted to succeed. His own account of the matter is "that finding that Religion, the great promoter of this style in other countries, rejected it in England, he was unwilling to sink into a portrait manufacturer, and, still ambitious of being singular, dropped all expectations of advancement from that source."

Hogarth, though he owed but little to any regular training,



THE HARLOT'S PROGRESS, BY WILLIAM HOGARTH.



His Work  
for Art  
Education.

was not unmindful of the advantages that training brings; and when, at Thornhill's death (in 1734), he found himself, as he expresses it, "in possession of his neglected apparatus," he hired the studio of Roubillac, in Peter's Court, St. Martin's Lane, and, with the aid of a few other artists, started a life school. This, with characteristic insularity, he declared to be "to every useful purpose equal to that in France, or any other." Here, at any rate, the greater part of the later artists of the reign of George II. were trained, and it continued to flourish until 1768, when "the apparatus" was transferred to the newly founded Royal Academy. A more doubtful service to art was his unremitting hostility to what he called the "Black Masters," or rather to those examples of them which were forced on the English public by picture dealers.<sup>1</sup> For, talking to Mrs. Piozzi of Dr. Johnson, he declared that his conversation was to other men's what Titian's painting was to Hudson's. "But," he hastened to add, "don't you tell people now that I say so, for the connoisseurs and I are at war, you know; and because I hate them they think I hate Titian—and let them."

He certainly was at great pains to give the world at large the notion that he detested and despised foreign art. In season and out of season he never wearied in his hostility. At his famous auction, in February, 1745, he issued a ticket admitting the holder "to be a bidder (if he thinks it proper) for Mr. Hogarth's pictures," and on it he depicts a fight between them and the Black Masters. A kneeling Magdalen digs a hole in the unfortunate Harlot; a St. Francis is equally discourteous to the inimitable prude in "Morning"; the tavern scene in "The Rake's Progress" cleaves its way through a Titian's "Feast of Olympus": and a "Midnight Modern Conversation" disperses Rubens's "Bacchanals." Obviously, it was not the blackness of the Old Masters that was their chief crime in Hogarth's eyes. The prices which the painter's works fetched on this occasion are worth recording:—

<sup>1</sup> An entertaining account of their artifices is given in Hogarth's letter to the *St. James's Evening Post* in defence of Sir James Thornhill's paintings, signed "Britophil" (1737: Dobson, "Hogarth," ed. 1893. p. 60). The dealer assures his customer that the Venus, which has not beauty enough to furnish an English cook-maid, is by Alesso Baldovinetto in his second and best manner, and by discovering imaginary beauties in the picture, persuades him to buy at a heavy price.

1784]

	£	s.	d.
Six "Harlot's Progress" at 14 guineas each ... ..	88	4	0
Eight "Rake's Progress" at 22 guineas each ... ..	184	16	0
"Morning," 20 guineas ... ..	21	0	0
"Noon," 37 guineas ... ..	38	17	0
"Evening," 38 guineas ... ..	39	18	0
"Night," 26 guineas ... ..	27	6	0
"Strolling Players," 26 guineas ... ..	27	6	0
	<hr/>		
	£427	7	0
	<hr/>		

The year 1745, when the sale we have mentioned took place, Hogarth's art was absolutely at its zenith. It was the year of the completion of "The Marriage à la Mode," the artist's masterpiece in satirical *genre*, and the year before his portrait of Simon Fraser, Lord Lovat, his masterpiece of portraiture. Probably not only for dramatic power, but for mere handicraft skill, the second picture of the "Marriage" series may be considered his high-water mark.

The  
"Marriage  
à la Mode"

The scope of the present work forbids the attempt adequately to review the work of this great artist. Our wonder at his greatness is not lessened by remembering what manner of man he was. Fortunately for us, he painted himself as he wished us to remember him, and the portrait is a veritable masterpiece of compendious biography. He shows us a homely, plebeian, pugnacious, unrefined personage, clear-eyed and matter-of-fact—not a great student, not a great thinker, but a straightforward searcher after the truth as he saw it. It is unnecessary to insist further on the limitations of his gift. His portraits, except where his sitter's face and figure lent themselves to satire, are undoubtedly commonplace. He could paint the grossness and treachery of Lord Lovat, or the humorous devilry of Wilkes, with *verve* and insight, but his "Captain Coram at the Foundling," though not an unpleasing picture, is a type of benevolent commonplace. His "Sigismunda," though even in colour and most carefully painted, is curiously wanting in force, and his sacred pictures, like the "Paul before Felix," in the lobby of Lincoln's Inn, have all the faults of the worst of the Black Masters. The figure of Paul might, indeed, well pass for an execrable example of the decadent schools of Italy. Nevertheless, he founded a school—mainly, it is true, a school of caricature, but none the less a genuine school

His  
School.

Hogarth's influence not only touched Gilray and Rowlandson, but it reached the Cruickshanks and the elder Doyle. Some may fancy that they note a reflexion of the satire of the "Progresses" in the rare moments of Leech's satire, and even in artists of a still later date. But, however much he has been excelled in some respects by the workers in black-and-

*The Dealer hereof is Entitled, if he thinks proper, to be a Builder for Mr Hogarth's Pictures, which are to be sold on the 1<sup>st</sup> Day of this Month.*



THE BATTLE OF THE PICTURES, BY WILLIAM HOGARTH.  
(From the Original Engraving.)

white of the nineteenth century, England's greatest dramatic draughtsman he must always be.

His  
Position  
as an  
Artist.

Hogarth's has been a healthy influence, too; for though, as we have said, he was poorly equipped in feeling for beauty of form, and he was far from being a great colourist, yet his execution was firm, his handling facile, and his colour sober and sometimes felicitous. But as his biographer has said once and for all, in a summing up which it would be wrong

to attenuate by any addition, neither by his achievements as an engraver, nor by his merits as a painter, does he retain his unique position among English artists. "It is as a pictorial chronicler of life and manners, as a satirist and humourist upon canvas, that he makes his chief claim upon posterity. His skill in seizing upon the ridiculous and the fantastic was only equalled by his power of rendering the tragic and the terrible. And it was not only given to him to see unerringly and to select unfalteringly, but to this was added a rare and special faculty for narrative by action. Other artists have succeeded in single scenes of humorous *genre*, or in isolated effects of passion and horror; but none has combined both with such signal ability, and carried them from one canvas to another with such assured dexterity, as this dramatist of the brush. To take some social blot, some burning fashionable vice, and hold it up sternly

to 'hard hearts'; to imagine it vividly, and body it forth with all the resources of unshrinking realism; to tear away its conventional trappings; to probe it to the quick, and lay bare its secret shameful workings to their inevitable end; to play upon it with inexhaustible ingenuity, with the keenest and happiest humour; to decorate it with the utmost profuseness of fanciful accessory and suggestive detail; to be conscious at the gravest how the grotesque in life elbows the pathetic, and the strange,



Photo: Walker & Colesell.

SIMON FRASER, LORD LOVAT, BY W. HOGARTH.

(National Portrait Gallery)

grating laugh of Mephistopheles is heard through the sorriest story. These were his gifts and this was his vocation — a vocation in which he has never yet been rivalled.”

**Landscape:**  
**Richard**  
**Wilson.**

If we may look upon Hogarth as the founder of *genre* painting in England, we may with equal justice regard Richard Wilson as the founder of English landscape, though not exactly of English modern landscape. He was Hogarth's junior by sixteen years, having been born in August, 1714, at Penagoes, a village in Montgomeryshire, of which his father was parson. He appears to have exhibited a natural aptitude for painting, for he was sent to London and placed in the studio of an obscure portrait painter named Wright. He himself started as a portrait painter, and though such portraits of his as we have do not exhibit any distinction, yet among his contemporaries a colourist like Wilson might easily have deserved a considerable popularity. At any rate, he was patronised by royalty, as appears by the portraits of “the Prince of Wales and Duke of York” now in the National Portrait Gallery. Up to the age of thirty-six he seems not only to have supported himself by his gains as a painter of likenesses, but to have saved sufficient money to enable him to realise the dream of his life—a visit to Italy.

In 1750 accordingly we find him in Italy, where he fell in with two painters whose influence determined his future career. The first, whom he encountered at Venice, was Zuccarelli, a master of artificial prettiness in the so-called classical manner. It is greatly to his credit that he recognised in Wilson a master talent, and urged him to devote his whole time to landscape. In Rome he found Claude Joseph Vernet, who, if brought up in a bad school, was not far from being a great master, and who reinforced Zuccarelli's recommendation. Wilson fell greatly under Vernet's influence, which was probably unfortunate, for, to Vernet, the country round the Eternal City (where he lived for twenty years) meant the entire world of landscape, and he communicated some of this narrowness of view to Wilson. At any rate, during the six years of his stay in Rome Wilson developed into a considerable landscape painter, with more than a slight mastery of that golden hazy sunlight in which his French friend excelled. Backed by Vernet's recommendations, he appears to have made enough



LANDSCAPE WITH FIGURES, BY RICHARD WILSON, R.A.  
(*National Gallery*.)

to live on there; but in 1757 he quitted Italy for England, and set up in London as a landscape painter pure and simple. A taste for landscape, whence arising it is not easy to determine, had sprung up in England, and promised well for Richard Wilson's future. But his hopes were doomed to disappointment. Zuccarelli had been before him, and he found the market glutted with the theatrical prettiness of the Italian. It is significant that in less than ten years of sojourn here Zuccarelli amassed a fortune by his brush, while a quarter of a century of conscientious labour found "Poor Dick," as his friends called him, within a measurable distance of starvation. In 1768, when the Royal Academy was founded, Wilson was one of the original members, and he afterwards obtained the post of Librarian to the Academy, which probably saved him from actual want. It is said that Penny informed him soon after his return to England, that he must adopt the lighter style of Zuccarelli if he wanted to succeed, and probably he was right; but Wilson refused—and starved.

Later, he suffered from the competition of Gainsborough's work, and from the reaction against the classical treatment of landscape. Mr. Ruskin has, indeed, accused Wilson of issuing "mere diluted adaptations of Poussin and Salvator," and of gathering his material in an abnormal district, the Campagna; but the criticism is obviously extravagant. Certainly his pictures show the influence of the artists whose follower he was, as well as of the scenes in which he learned his art. His foliage recalls Claude and Poussin; there is a flavour of the Campagna about his Welsh landscape; and the texture of his rocks is apt to suggest tufa rather than the Cambrian series. But his landscapes are full of noble qualities. They are broad and solid, essentially conceived in the grand style, and impressive in composition. Though now mostly darkened by age, they are frequently fine in colour, while the golden glow of the Italian sun still lives in many of his skies. To the day of his death fortune never came to him, but he was always faithful to his art; and though, in his lifetime, he had few imitators, posterity has done him justice.

How considerable an artist in landscape Wilson was can be gauged, to some extent, by considering the work of his more successful contemporaries, Zuccarelli, George Lambert,

and the Smiths of Chichester. In their work we have all the mannerisms of Claude and Poussin—the classical temples and nymphs under the trees, without any trace of that largeness of feeling which redeems in great part the old masters' artificiality. Yet George Smith's imitations fetched far higher prices than Wilson's; and in a landscape competition, instituted at the Society of Arts, he carried away the prize from him.

Other  
Land-  
scapists.

A few sea-painters deserve to be remembered. Peter Monamy lived and worked till 1749, and Samuel Scott continued the tradition of the Vandeweldes in representing "the calm plane of the ocean level." Indeed, Horace Walpole goes so far as to call him the first painter of the age. He painted a few landscapes also, and, if somewhat mechanical, was a sound draughtsman. He was almost contemporary with Wilson, having been born in 1710 and dying in 1772. Much the same may be said of George Brooking, Richard Paton, and William James, who a little later had considerable vogue, and who were probably influenced by Canaletto, who came to England in 1746. That famous artist stayed here two years, and seems to have found the monotony of London brick, and the cooler tones of our northern climate, more congenial to his unimaginative temperament than the marble splendours and flooding sunlight of his native Venice. Perhaps the earliest nature painter who shows a following after Wilson was the Irishman, George Barret, of Dublin, who, though more artificial in treatment than Wilson, had a more considerable vogue. It is said that he was in receipt of £2,000, per annum from his landscapes at a time when Wilson was starving in an obscure lodging at the corner of North Street, Fitzroy Square. He died in 1784, two years after his greater but less fortunate contemporary.

Marine  
Painters

We have seen how, during the reign of George II., English *genre* sprang, as it were, fully equipped from the brain of Hogarth, and how Wilson painted the first great English landscapes. The same reign witnessed equally the budding, if not the full bloom, of our national school of portraiture. This school, in the persons of Reynolds, Gainsborough, and Romney, was destined to the highest distinction, and, indeed, made the eighteenth century the golden age of English art. Of that

Portrait  
Painters.





OLD LONDON BRIDGE, 1745, BY SAMUEL SCOTT.  
(*National Gallery.*)

1742-1784]

famous triumvirate Gainsborough was the deffest, Romney the most graceful and engaging, but Reynolds was unmistakably the greatest. He led the way, and to his other laurels those of the pioneer must be added. The sudden rise of the school at this particular moment is singular, for, if we except the work of the Scotchman, Allan Ramsay, which is always virile and unaffected, portraiture in England was then at almost its lowest ebb. From Vandyck to Lely, from Lely to Kneller, from Kneller to Hudson, the art had not been at a standstill, but its movement had been uniformly downwards.


It was in the studio of the lowest member in the descending series that Reynolds acquired the rudiments of his profession. He was the son of a poor Devonshire vicar who eked out his slender stipend by keeping a school, and at eighteen was placed with Hudson. His father, a kindly but hardly a talented man, gave his son a respectable if not a very high education, and, which is more important, imbued him with a really fine appreciation of what we now call culture. How he worked, or what teaching he received in Hudson's studio in Great Queen Street, cannot be determined, but he probably carried away very little. In after years he used to lament the lack of an academical education and his want of that "facility of drawing the naked figure which an artist ought to have." At any rate, though it had been arranged that he should be with Hudson for four years, he quitted him after two, and returning to Devonshire, set up as a portrait-painter at what was then known as Plymouth Dock, and is now known as Devonport. For a time he became the fashion there; but the fashion passed, and he returned to London. Then, for two years (1744 to 1746), he painted portraits in the metropolis, in which, as has been well said, "we can see the pupil struggling against the thralldom of the master." But his father's death removed him from the dangerous proximity and advice of Hudson, and he returned once more to Plymouth. There he was fortunate in encountering a local artist, William Gandy, a ne'er-do-weel of genuine talent, whose homely maxim, that a "picture ought to have a richness in its texture, as if the colours were made of cream and cheese," was a valuable truth to a lad who had been taught to take the wooden similitudes of Hudson for

**Reynold  
Early  
Training**

works of art. It is clear that his progress was already considerable. His portrait of Lady Somers, which was painted 1747-8, shows us a Reynolds, youthful, perhaps, and immature, but recognisably Reynolds, and a Reynolds completely emancipated from the evil traditions of Great Queen Street.

Visits  
Italy.

A rare accident—the fact that Admiral Keppel, at a chance meeting in the big house at Mount Edgcumbe, took a fancy




SIR JOSHUA REYNOLDS, P.R.A., BY HIMSELF.

(National Gallery.)

to him—led to the fulfilment of the dream of all painters, a visit to Italy. Keppel took him there in his ship, the *Centurion*, and after some delay at Minorca and various places, which Reynolds utilised to practise his trade, he was finally landed at Leghorn at the close of 1750. His visit lasted less than three years, a little more than two of which were spent in Rome, some four or five months being allotted to Florence and Venice and the rest of Italy. But he came back a great painter, with what he called his “indigested notions” totally done away with. In January, 1753, he es-

His  
Success.

tablished himself permanently in London, and thenceforward almost till his death, thirty-nine years later, he laboured in-



AUGUSTUS, VISCOUNT KEPPEL, BY SIR J. REYNOLDS.

*(By permission of the Right Hon. the Earl of Rosebery.)*

cessantly at the production of that noble series of portraits which have made the name of "Sir Joshua" a synonym for masterly characterisation. When we say that he came back a great artist we do not mean to say that his development

was completed: his artistic life was a long struggle for improvement, and it was only in his last years, after his paralytic stroke, that he reached that Venetian fulness of colour for which he had been striving all his life. But in 1753 he painted the portrait of his great friend, Admiral Keppel, and this *beau idéal* of the resolute and intrepid sailor, if it had been his first and last work, would have stamped its author as a master of his means. It is, perhaps, hardly an exaggeration to say that character had never been so painted in England in the memory of living men, and small wonder is it that this picture brought the author instant fame and the promise of fortune. Noblemen crowded to the studio, and everybody who claimed to be somebody came to Reynolds to be painted. His studio, as one of his numerous biographers has said, was "crowded with women who wished to be transmuted as angels, as well as men who wished to appear as heroes and philosophers." And he retained this amazing popularity to the end of his life. Other painters—great men like Gainsborough and Romney, and strong men like Opie, seemed for a moment to dispute the pride of place with him; but except for a short time, when Romney was the rage of the greater half of the town, his supremacy was never seriously threatened.

It may be of interest to trace the swelling tide of his success, according to the prosaic scale of the prices asked and obtained. The late Richard Redgrave, R.A., gives us the facts on this head as follows:—

"Farington tells us that while Reynolds resided in St. Martin's Lane his prices for portraits were—three-quarters, ten guineas; half-length, twenty guineas; whole length, forty guineas. His master Hudson's prices were rather higher, and were soon adopted by him. About four or five years later both raised their prices to fifteen, thirty, and sixty guineas for the three classes of portraits respectively. In 1760 Reynolds removed to Leicester Square, and then his prices were twenty-five, fifty, and one hundred guineas for the three classes of portrait. In 1781, we learn from Malone, his prices were fifty, one hundred, and two hundred guineas, and continued so till his death. For the 'Mrs. Siddons as the Tragic Muse,' in the Dulwich Gallery, Mr. Desenfans paid him seven hundred guineas. For the priceless 'Strawberry Girl,' 'The Muscipula,' and the 'Shepherd Boy,' his price was fifty guineas each. For his historical works he was paid at about the same rate—the 'Death of Dido,' now in the Royal Collection, two hundred guineas; 'Death of Cardinal Beaufort,' five

hundred guineas; and for his Russian picture, 'Hercules strangling the Serpents,' fifteen hundred guineas."

Before touching on his share in the establishment of the Royal Academy, and the work of his great contemporaries exhibited there, an endeavour must be made to define, however imperfectly, the contribution made by Reynolds to the

Work  
as an  
Artist.



THE STRAWBERRY GIRL, BY SIR J. REYNOLDS.

(The Wallace Collection, Hertford House.)

growth of English art. "You don't paint like Sir Godfrey," they said to Reynolds; and, fortunately for the world, the charge was true. The *mesne*, or general portrait of Kneller, with its conventional aims, passed into the *néant* with the coming of Sir Joshua. The individual portrait was the portrait of Sir Joshua. In him the gift of painting men and women was supreme. Not only did he paint them in their habit as they lived, but with such masterly suggestion of character as

*pennello volante*, as Angelica Kauffmann called it—gave a texture in which there was always a play of light and shadow, sometimes a genuine sparkle and vivacity. He seized the individual attitude, the idiosyncratic gesture, whether it was Mrs. Siddons turning to look at something on the wall, or Sir James Hunter falling into a brown study, or the child climbing on its mother's back. He sought and found the movement that differentiates the sitter. He drew the dress as he saw it, arranged, no doubt, but the real thing that the limbs underneath informed, were it a duchess's chiffons or an admiral's uniform. And as for character, no depth was too deep, no frivolity too *passager*, for him to catch.

Limit-  
ations.

The limitations and deficiencies of Sir Joshua's art more readily lend themselves to a summary indication than its admirable qualities. We have already endeavoured to suggest how great a painter of real men and women, and, above all, of children, he was. Nor did it matter whether they were clothed in the workaday garb of the eighteenth century or masqueraded as historical or mythological personages, as Cupid or Circe, as Lesbia or Harry VIII. He painted them, as we have seen, with the most complete success, with the utmost simplicity, and without a hint of staginess, yet with rare dignity and distinction. But when he attempted historical and religious subjects his failure is no less complete. His heroes and his saints, his Ugolinos and Holy Families, are unique in their combination of the stagey with the commonplace. He looked up to the religious masterpieces of the Italians with awe and reverence; he was for ever singing the praises of a lofty ideal in art, but he rarely felt courage for grappling with it. His admiration, his enthusiasm for the Old Masters was profound and sincere to the day of his death. In the concluding lecture of the course that he delivered to the students—the last, as it proved, that he was ever to deliver—he thus spoke of Michael Angelo:—

“ Were I now to begin the world again I would tread in the steps of that great master: to kiss the hem of his garment, to catch the slightest of his perfections, would be glory and distinction enough for an ambitious man. I feel a self-congratulation in knowing myself capable of such sensations as he intended to excite. I reflect, not without vanity, that these Discourses bear testimony of my admiration of that truly divine man; and I should desire

that the last words which I should pronounce in this Academy. and from this place, might be the name of Michael Angelo."

But, as Mr. Ruskin says, he never thought of following out the purpose of Michael Angelo and "painting a Last Judgment upon Squires with the scene of it laid in Leicestershire." And we may be thankful that he did not. His drawing of the more familiar accessories was facile and accurate, but he was occasionally careless; his dogs and horses are conventional, while the live panther in "Circe" appears to be execrably stuffed.

The defects of Reynolds's methods are so intimately bound up with his excellencies that it is difficult to sever them. When he told his pupils, "Consider the object before you as more made out by light and shadow than by lines," he gave them the advice that he always followed. "He never seems to have seen outline," says a professional critic, "but the whole as a picture—its breadth, colour, light and shade. His eye was always dwelling on the relation of parts, and of the figure to the ground. When it melted into the ground he was not seeking to find the form, but was content, with Nature, to lose it. Even the light and shade seems to be considered less as light and shade than as different modifications of a coloured surface, which one may suppose him mentally matching as a lady does her silks. Yet compared with the great masters of his idolatry, Giorgione, Titian and Tintoret (for Rembrandt, strangely enough, he failed to appreciate), his work is, to quote Mr. Ruskin once more, "at its best, only magnificent sketching." Yet for giving the effects that he aimed at, what method could have been better? Its very slightness is engaging, and addresses itself "purposefully to the casual glance and common thought—eager to arrest the passer-by, but careless to detain him, or detaining him, if at all, by an unexplained enchantment, not by continuance of teaching or development of idea."

His  
Methods.

The worst result of Reynolds's manipulation was the want of permanence in his pictures. True follower as he was of the Italians, he paid somewhat dearly for his devotion. For he owed his deafness to a cold caught in the corridors of the Vatican; and to his persistent search after "the secret of the Venetians" we may attribute those experiments in colour which have worked the ruin of a majority of his pictures. He himself deplored that he was not early instructed in the



principles of colouring, and saw that his unsteadiness and fickleness of mode "arose from an eager desire to attain the highest excellence." Modern expert opinion declares that he used wax and all kinds of improper vehicles, and habitually combined such as are, to use a medical phrase, "incompatibles." He placed soft media under hard, rapidly-drying media under slowly-drying ones, and used for his glazings uncertain vegetable pigments, or mineral pigments rendered unsuitable by unscientific combination. Beautiful results were thus undoubtedly obtained, but they were generally evanescent. Some of his pictures failed soon after they left the easel, many in the lifetimes of the sitters, so that the epigram attributed to Sir Walter Blackett only expressed the melancholy truth :—

"Painting of old was surely well designed  
To keep the features of the dead in mind;  
But this great rascal has reversed the plan,  
And made the picture die before the man."

But though we have to deplore the fact that many of his early pictures are but the bloodless phantoms of their former selves, and that many of his latter works are blurred by a swarthy covering of oxidised varnish, there are qualities of distinction even in these ruins that we look for in vain in the work of any other Englishman.

The Royal  
Academy.

The life of Reynolds, his friendships and his dislikes, the quarrels which momentarily ruffled the placid flow of his singularly beautiful life, cannot be here recounted. But there is one incident with which his name is associated that must be mentioned, as it forms an epoch in the history of English art, and influences it to the present hour. This was the foundation of the Royal Academy, in the year 1768. Of course, the idea of such an institution was no new thing. In 1711 Kneller and some of his followers had endeavoured to establish a national school for drawing. We have already noticed Thornhill's academy, carried on later by Hogarth, and which, under Moser, had experienced various vicissitudes. But in 1760, after the first exhibition in the Adelphi, "The Society of Artists" established annual exhibitions, and in 1765 obtained a royal charter of incorporation under that name. It provided for a directorate of twenty-four, to whom the election of fellows

was entrusted. The painters Wilson, Hayman, Moser, were among the first directors, as were the architects Paine and Chambers, McArdell the engraver, and Wilton the sculptor. But fellows and directors never seemed able to agree, and



MARY, DUCHESS OF ANCASTER.

(Engraved by J. McArdell, after T. Hudson.)

fierce internecine quarrels ensued. At length, at a meeting held in October, 1768, the directors were crushed by a general vote of the fellows; sixteen were refused re-election, and the rest resigned.

An attempt was then made to set up a rival society, and

Benjamin West, who, though recently established in London, had the ear of the Court, contrived to explain that the directors were not responsible for what his Majesty called "these indecent bickerings." Chambers, who was architect to the king, was deputed to wait on him, and to humbly inform him that many artists of reputation, together with himself, were desirous of establishing a society that should more especially promote the arts of design, and praying his Majesty's gracious patronage. The king was favourably disposed, and an outline of the scheme, drawn up by Moser, Chambers, and Francis Cotes, was submitted for the royal consideration and, after some negotiation, approved. It was the universal opinion among the artists that Reynolds's co-operation was necessary. He had some time before resigned his membership of the old society, which was temporarily presided over by Kirby, whose position was probably due to the fact that he had been the king's drawing-master. For some unexplained reason great secrecy had been observed, and Reynolds was kept in ignorance of what was going on. By the 9th of November, 1768, matters had progressed so far that a list of members had been made out, and a meeting of the artists was fixed to take place at Wilton's house, to nominate the officials. What took place in regard to Reynolds has often been debated.<sup>1</sup>

On the next day, the 10th of November, the king formally approved and signed the instrument incorporating the Academy, and the first general meeting of the newly constituted body took place on the 14th of November, 1768. The instrument declares that the members of the Royal Academy shall not be members of any other Society of Artists established in London—a provision palpably directed against the Incorporated Society, and excluding from the new Academy Romney, Allan Ramsay, Hudson, and, it would seem for the moment, Gainsborough.

"There are at this time," said the new President, in his discourse delivered at the opening of the Academy, "a greater

<sup>1</sup> Messrs. Leslie and Tom Taylor, who had access to the original minute books of the Academy, assert authoritatively that Reynolds, after much hesitation (Kirby having led him to believe that the design lacked the royal sanction) was at length persuaded by West to attend the preliminary meeting, that he arrived late—as it was just breaking up; but that on his arrival the rules were passed, and the Academy was formally constituted.

number of excellent artists than were ever before at one period in this nation"; and, though they were not all members of the Academy, the statement was undoubtedly true. Who these "excellent artists" were may be gathered from the list of the first members of the Academy in the catalogue to the first exhibition, containing the following names, amongst which will be noticed those of seven foreigners and two ladies:—

"Sir Joshua Reynolds, President; Sir William Chambers, Treasurer; George Michael Moser, Keeper; Francis Milner Newton, Secretary; Edward Penny, Professor of Painting; Thomas Sandby, Professor of Architecture; Samuel Wale, Professor of Perspective; William Hunter, M.D., Professor of Anatomy; Francis Hayman, Librarian; Tan-Chet-Tna (a Chinese modeller, apparently a sort of Honorary Academician); George Barrett; Francesco Bartolozzi; Edward Burch; Agostino Carlini; Charles Catton; Mason Chamberlain; J. Baptist Cipriani; Richard Cosway; John Gwynu; William Hoare; Nathaniel Hone; Mrs. Angelica Kauffmann; Jeremiah Meyer; Mrs. Mary Moser; Joseph Nollekens; John Richards; Paul Sandby; Domenic Serres; Peter Toms; William Tyler; Benjamin West; Richard Wilson; Joseph Milton; Richard Yeo; John Zoffany; Francesco Zuccarelli."

Gainsborough's name is wanting, but it was probably an oversight, as in the body of the first official catalogue we find the letters "R.A." placed against his name. It is probable that Romney's name was omitted purposely (p. 399). At any rate, he never sent any pictures to the Academy's exhibitions, and never sought to be enrolled among its members. Gainsborough, on the other hand, if he took little interest in its proceedings, was for many years a regular contributor.

It is interesting to learn what "the pictures of the year" were in the year 1 of the exhibition, and they are worth enumerating for the indication thus afforded of the direction of the public taste and of the artistic talent which satisfied it. The president exhibited four canvases, including the group of Mrs. Bouverie and Mrs. Crewe, and the masterpiece of Miss Morris as "Hope nursing Love." Other attractions were—Francis Cotes's "Hebe"; Angelica Kauffmann's "Hector and Andromache" and "Venus directing Aeneas"; Nathaniel Dance's portrait of the king and queen; Hone's "Piping Boy"; Cipriani's "Annunciation"; West's "Venus lamenting Adonis" and "The Departure of Regulus"; and the portrait of Lady Molyneux, by Gainsborough.

First  
Academy  
Exhibition

Such were the beginnings of the Royal Academy, an institution which undoubtedly gave an enormous impetus to English art. If it has never succeeded as a teacher, it has been of immense value as an introducer. To it the artist has owed a larger public, and a more dignified position, than before. From the first it has patronised mediocrity, but still, on the whole, it has rewarded merit. Moreover, it created a tribunal, however far from a perfect one, yet one administering a sort of justice, and in which, at any rate, artists have had more confidence than in the irresponsible critic and the interested dealer.

Thomas  
Gains-  
borough.

Gainsborough, as we have said, was not among the list of the original Academicians. But that he deserved that honour more than any man living, except Sir Joshua, no sane person will dispute. He was born in the spring of 1727 at Sudbury, in Suffolk, of a lower middle-class family of Dissenters. His father was a clothier by trade, and Gainsborough, less fortunate than his rival, received an imperfect education at the local grammar school, whence he often played truant. While a mere child he began to paint, and his earliest studies show a hardy attempt to deal directly with Nature. At the early age of fourteen he was sent to London, and placed with Gravelot, a clever illustrator of books, from whom he probably got some good. Subsequently he was at the St. Martin's Lane Academy, and studied under the jovial scene-painter, Hayman, from whom he probably got some harm. His best education was, no doubt, obtained from out-of-door sketching, and in making copies from the Dutch masters, whose work, both in landscape and portraits, had an attraction for him that Reynolds never seemed to have understood. Not finding an opening in London, Gainsborough (then only nineteen) returned to Suffolk, where he married Margaret Burr, a pretty girl with a small fortune. He started in his business at Ipswich, quickly securing the patronage of the neighbouring gentry, painting numerous portraits of their wives and daughters, as well as of their country-houses. About nine years later, on the advice of Mr. Thicknesse, governor of Landguard Fort, he removed to Bath. The way he first attracted Thicknesse's attention has a curiously boyish air. Seeing a dejected face looking over the wall of a friend's garden, he was told that the poor fellow had been standing there all day, and was much impressed on discovering that the "poor fellow" was an effigy

painted by Gainsborough. At Bath Gainsborough's success was immediate and complete, and he soon was able to raise his terms to forty and one hundred guineas for half- and full-lengths, obviously remarkable prices for a provincial artist. In 1761 he exhibited in London for the first time. This was at the exhibition held in the rooms of the Society of Arts, and the portrait has been identified as that of Earl Nugent. Between that year and 1768 he executed fifteen portraits—including those of Lady Grosvenor and the Duke of Argyll, of General Honynwood on his horse, with a background of forest foliage, and of the actors Quin and Garrick, this last characterised by Mrs. Garrick as "the best portrait ever painted of my Davy."

From the foundation of the Academy Gainsborough was a regular contributor of pictures to the exhibitions, including a few—though, under the circumstances, curiously few—landscapes. During his residence in the country his pictures were conveyed by a carrier, Wiltshire, who refused to take money for this service, and in consequence was paid in a coinage which he appreciated far more than gold—viz. in Gainsboroughs. But in 1774 the painter returned to London, and set up his studio at Schomberg House in Pall Mall. There seems, at all times, to have been considerable rivalry between Gainsborough and the other academicians. He had protested, in 1772, against what he considered their unfair manner of hanging his pictures, and during the next two years had exhibited nothing. Nevertheless, in December, 1774, he was elected on the council, probably on his coming to reside in town, and actually received a vote for the presidency. But, absorbed in his art and in his violin—for he was a gifted and passionate musician—he never attended a single meeting. This gave, as might be expected, considerable umbrage to his colleagues on the council, and a motion was made to omit his name from their lists; but it was, however, dropped, and he recommenced the despatch of pictures to the exhibition.

Later a more serious quarrel arose. Gainsborough had requested that his portraits of the three princesses (the Princess Royal, the Princess Augusta, and the Princess Elizabeth), which had been expressly painted to fill certain panels in a room in Carlton Palace, might be hung at the panel height in the exhibition. This reasonable request was contemptuously ignored

Gains-  
boroug  
and th  
Acader

on the trivial pretext that the Academy rule was to hang portraits on the portrait line. Naturally the artist was offended. He withdrew the pictures before the exhibition opened, and never again sent a picture for exhibition. This was in 1784, and he had then been practising his art in London for ten years. They were halcyon years for the painter; the quantity of his work was wonderful, and the quality of his sitters no less so. But all through his life, in the time of fortune as in the time of obscurity, he continued faithful to his love of landscape. Though pecuniarily they were unremunerative, every year he painted one or more landscapes—in 1780 the number was six. But purchasers were so scarce that the walls of the passage from his painting room were covered with them. Even a masterpiece like “The Woodman in the Storm,” highly praised as it was by contemporary critics, was unable to find a purchaser at a hundred guineas.

It is, of course, in meagre notes like these, impossible to discuss even a small proportion of Gainsborough’s masterpieces. One, however, must be particularly mentioned, than which none has excited more admiration or been the theme of more animated controversy. This is the portrait of Master Buttall, commonly known as “The Blue Boy.” It is supposed, and there is a good deal to be said for the hypothesis, that it was painted for the express purpose of refuting one of Sir Joshua’s theories. It is the one set forth in the eighth of those “discourses” delivered to the students, which positively teem with illuminative thoughts, and yet, when they formulate canons of art or criticism, seem to go strangely wide of the mark. The passage is as follows:—


“The  
Blue  
Boy.”

“It ought, in my opinion, to be indispensably observed that the masses of light in a picture be always of a warm, mellow colour, yellow, red, or a yellowish white; and that the blue, the grey, or the green colours be kept almost entirely out of these masses, and be used only to support and set off these warm colours.”

The date usually assigned to the picture is 1779, soon after the delivery of the lecture, but it has been suggested that it was exhibited at the Academy in 1770, as the portrait of a young gentleman of which Mary Moser wrote that in it Gainsborough “is beyond himself.” Hence the suggestion that it was Reynolds who desired to depreciate Gainsborough’s method; but this

1784]

slightly spiteful proceeding is quite unlike Reynolds, and, in view of the success of the picture, it would have been more than slightly futile. The relation between the picture and the passage is certainly remarkable; but, if exhibited in 1770, Reynolds might easily have forgotten all about it in 1778. Nor would this really be so very surprising, for undoubtedly when he wrote the passage he had forgotten (so full was he of the



*Photo: Walker & Cockerell.*

THOMAS GAINSBOROUGH, R.A., BY HIMSELF.

*(National Portrait Gallery.)*

memories of the Venetian gold) that masses of just such blue are to be found in Vandyck and other great masters of silvery effects. The picture itself is a portrait of a pretty, dark-haired, dark-eyed boy, modishly dressed in a satin jacket, silk stockings with ribbon knots at the knees, and rosettes on his shoes. With the exception of the collarette, which is of white muslin, and the slashings of the sleeves, the whole picture is of the shade known as royal blue. But (as an admirable critic admirably puts it) how shall we give an idea of the harmony of the picture?




"How can we convey to the reader, with any accuracy, its delicacies, the reflections, the high lights, the bright bits of colour, and the soft, warm, deep shades which, blending together, reduce and modify the intensity of the full colour! How can we show the variety of expedients by which the master has managed his shadows, causing the young figure to stand out from a background of autumnal foliage of russet and green tints, and from a powerful sky full of breeze and movement! One must see and admire the picture, and carry away from it the impression made by a masterpiece. Still, if we really wish to gain some conception of this marvellous work, we are tempted, in spite of the vagueness and perhaps puerility of the idea, to strive to recall the happiest reminiscences of Watteau and Vandyck—the boldness and perfect grace of Watteau, and the severe elegance of Vandyck."

Gains-  
borough's  
Art.

Gainsborough, unlike his great rivals, Reynolds, Wilson, Romney, never, so far as we know, left England—never, certainly, studied in Italy, at the feet of the early fathers of art. No really great painter ever had less training, but if in any case the want can be supplied by genius, it was so in the case of Gainsborough. Of course, he was influenced by the works of others, though not, we think, to any large extent, except by the half-English Vandyck. Thus it is that we find him absolutely the most independent of masters, not only in conception, but in execution. As a draughtsman he is occasionally at fault, as a colourist never, and the *chic* (to use the modern term) with which he paints such things as powdered hair and caps and ruffles (in which Sir Joshua followed him from afar) is simply marvellous. "Gainsborough's power of colour," says Mr. Ruskin in "Modern Painters," "is capable of taking rank beside that of Rubens. He is the finest colourist, Sir Joshua himself not excluded, of the whole English school." And this is not only Gainsborough, the painter of Mrs. Graham and "the divine duchess," of Mrs. Fitzherbert and Mrs. Siddons, but of the "Cottage Girl" and "The Watering Place," "The Harvest Waggon," "The Market Cart," and scores of other noble landscapes of his which are scattered about England. Even in some of his early pictures, painted obviously under Dutch influence, the same feeling for colour is observable.

Reynolds once, at an Academy banquet, referred to Gainsborough as "our best landscape painter," to which Richard Wilson replied, not unadroitly, "and our best portrait painter

also." But, in truth, modern English landscape was initiated by Gainsborough. He found that the homesteads and churches of Wessex and of East Anglia, their woods and lanes and rivulets, were fuller of material for the painter than the glorious waste of the Campagna and the ruins of Roman villas and aqueducts.



THE MARKET CART, BY T. GAINSBOROUGH.  
(National Portrait Gallery.)

His landscape admits no sham nymphs and Roman ladies in classical attire; his rustics are true children of the soil, and their rags are real rags, however simply picturesque. So, too, of the general form of his tree groups, of his shadowy lanes and woods. They are beautiful because selected with the unerring eye of a man powerfully moved by the feeling for

natural beauty. Yet, admirable as the massed trees are, in matter of foliage they are not more realistic than Wilson's. He is quite as indifferent to the delicate distinctions of elm and beech and oak, and the weeds and grasses of the foregrounds belong often to a non-existent flora. Nothing can well be more misleading than to say of him, as Sir Joshua Reynolds did, that it is difficult to determine whether Gainsborough's portraits are most admirable for exact truth of resemblance, or his landscapes for a portrait-like representation of nature. His charm in each is something quite different. He gives us more of beauty in each, more of nature in each, than a photographically exact rendering could possibly do. And thus it is that his landscape art, notwithstanding its obvious limitations, appeals to the most cursory observer, and his pictures seem bits of a real country-side, and redolent with the charm of country life. The great service that Gainsborough did for the art of his country was in finally emancipating it from the old conventions. He "gave himself up wholly to nature," and resolutely cast aside all that came between him and her, and she rewarded her worshipper in the sight of all men.

Gainsborough's tale of work must have been immense, for he painted hard for forty-three years, and was as swift a worker, perhaps swifter when he pleased, than his great rival, but was far more careless of his pictures, many of which have disappeared. On the other hand, where the canvases have survived, they have not generally suffered much deterioration. He was still in the plenitude of his powers when, in 1788, he was carried off by a rapid cancerous affection. Reynolds, from whom, since the quarrel with the Academy, Gainsborough had been more or less estranged, was sent for to the bedside of his great rival. Bending over the dying man, he caught almost his last words. They were words of peace and goodwill: "We are all going to heaven, and Vandyck is of the party." So ended Thomas Gainsborough, the kind-hearted, emotional painter-musician—the great lover of beauty, the sensitive colourist, the man of instinct, the born artist to the tips of his fingers. His rival Reynolds, the man of observation and intelligence, the great master of character—and principally of virile and stately character, though his sympathy with child-life was



THE HON MRS. GRAHAM, BY THOMAS GAINSBOROUGH, R.A.

unequalled—survived him but four years. The third of the great triumvirate lived fourteen years longer.

**Romney :  
Early life.**

This man, George Romney, remains to be spoken of. Let it be said at once, his was a lower and more animal temperament—a less perfect, a less conscientious artist, more susceptible to the commoner delights of pretty things, and so, perhaps, he comes to be the most engagingly human, and the most sympathetic of them all. He was born at Beckside, near Dalton-in-Furness, Lancashire, in 1734, of quite humble parents. His father was one of the peasant proprietors, who in the neighbouring counties are known as statesmen, and practised the trade of a joiner; he was an ingenious man—a sort of Jack of all trades, known among his neighbours as honest John Rumney (for this was the original spelling of the name), but he was naturally without the rudiments of education. George Romney was, in respect of opportunities, thus immensely worse off than Reynolds, the son of a poor clergyman, or Gainsborough, the son of a well-to-do tradesman. The neighbourhood of Romney's home is picturesque, and he lived in the sight of the mountains; but this was almost his sole advantage, for he was brought up amongst unlettered agriculturists and artisans, whose ideas of art were limited to the red lions and green dragons that swung over public-house doors. All the education that he ever received was obtained before he was twelve years old, at a school kept by a clergyman named Fell, who instructed bucolic youths for the modest honorarium of five shillings per quarter. His father, however, thought the expenditure excessive, or at least unremunerative, and removed him to the carpenter's bench. There he worked at joinery, and did a little simple carving, obtaining, indeed, some reputation for his rustic fiddles. But his passion for drawing, and a chance portrait that excited the admiration of a neighbour, induced his father to apprentice him, at the age of nineteen, to an artist named Steele. The man was a dissolute fellow, who boasted of having been a pupil of Vanloo's at Paris, and whose Frenchified ways gained for him the contemptuous nickname of "Count" Steele. This mediocre practitioner was Romney's first and only master, but, perhaps fortunately, did not teach him much.

While Romney was in Steele's service he fell ill, and was

1784]

tenderly nursed by a housemaid named Mary Abbot, whom on his recovery he married. He was then twenty-one. Steele wandered away to York, taking his apprentice with him: and the removal was so far fortunate that it led to some of Romney's drawings coming under the notice of the neighbouring Vicar of Sutton, who was no other than the Rev. Laurence Sterne. At York, too, he bought a few prints of Dutch masters, which at his leisure he copied in oils. At



*Photo: Walker & Cockerell.*

GEORGE ROMNEY, BY HIMSELF (UNFINISHED).

(National Portrait Gallery).

the close of his apprenticeship he went to Kendal, not far from his old home, and there eked out a living by portrait painting and by raffling his copies of old Dutch pictures. At length he saved enough to take him to London, for which he departed in 1762, leaving some two-thirds of his savings with his wife. It does not seem that there was in this any pre-meditated desertion, as has been suggested, the painter's object being simply to seek a better opening for his talents. In London he first obtained notice for his historical subjects,

Remove  
to Lond

such as the "Death of General Wolfe," which was awarded a first prize at the Society of Arts exhibition, though the award was annulled at the instigation, as Romney believed, of Sir Joshua (then Mr.) Reynolds. He was subsequently more successful in these historical compositions, and his own desire was to shine as an historical painter, but, fortunately for us all, the popular demand obliged him, in spite of himself, to become the third portrait painter of England. His financial success was, however, sufficient to put him in a position to defray the expenses of a journey to Paris, where he had a cordial welcome from Joseph Vernet, then engaged on a commission from Louis XV. to paint the great seaports of France. Returning to London he continued his work, and subsequently revisited his family at the north. It was in this epoch, some two years before the foundation of the Royal Academy, that he made the acquaintance of Richard Cumberland, who sat to him, and whose enthusiastic admiration proved of high service to the painter in his lifetime, and did something for his posthumous fame. The picture that Cumberland drew of Romney with his pen shows admirable insight, and resembles one of those masterly sketches for which the painter's brush is famed. "Romney," he says,

"Shy, private, studious and contemplative, conscious of all the disadvantages of a stinted education, of a habit naturally hypochondriac, with aspen nerves that every breath could ruffle, was at once in art the rival, and in nature the very contrast, of Sir Joshua. A man of few wants, strict economy, and with no dislike to money, he had opportunities enough to enrich him even to satiety; but he was at once so eager to begin and so slow to finish his portraits, that he was for ever disappointed of receiving payments for them by the casualties and revolutions in the families they were designed for. So many of his sitters were killed off, so many favourite ladies were dismissed, so many fond wives divorced before he could bestow half an hour's pains upon their petticoats, that his unsaleable stock was immense; whilst with a little more regularity and decision he would have more than doubled his fortune, and escaped an infinity of petty troubles that disturbed the temper."

In 1776, shortly after his meeting with Cumberland, he removed to Newport Street, then quite a fashionable quarter for artists, where he painted Mrs. Yates as "The Tragic Muse," and rapidly acquired considerable vogue. The cause of his exclusion from the Academy remains something of a

mystery, for his membership of the Society of Artists was an easily removable disqualification. It was probably due most of all to the fact that he was a poor, unlettered man, and at that date unfit either for literary or quasi-fashionable society—a kind of disqualification which has at all times had no inconsiderable weight in academical counsels. Still, he had great success with the outside world; but conscious, in the



RICHARD CUMBERLAND, BY G. ROMNEY.

(*National Portrait Gallery.*)

midst of his success, of the deficiencies of his training, he threw up his studio and went to Italy with the miniature-painter Ozias Humphrey. He made serious and prolonged studies in the Vatican, and afterwards at Parma, besides drawing much from the nude model. His studies left a lasting impression on his manner, and if they are responsible for his perhaps too persistent passion for a sort of classical drapery, the drapery of the sculptor rather than of the painter, he owed to them no small share of the simplicity



and dignity which, added to an intimate and vivid personal grace peculiarly his own, make up his almost indescribable charm. Probably, too, as one of his biographers has put it, these studies enabled him to avoid the snare of affectation into which even his greater rivals not infrequently fell.

After his return to England his practice increased rapidly, and he took the house in Cavendish Square formerly tenanted by Cotes, the *pastelliste*. Reynolds's dislike for "the man in Cavendish Square," as he called him, has never been quite explained, but it is greatly to Romney's credit that he never disparaged his rival, and always replied to the detractors of Reynolds—"He is the greatest painter that ever lived. I see in his pictures an exquisite charm that I see in nature, but in no other pictures." This—from the painter of Mrs. Anne Carwardine and her child, of the Sempstress, of the Reading Girl Serena, of Miss Cumberland, of Mrs. Stables and her daughters, of Lady Milner, and of Admiral Yorke as a boy—was, at least, praise worth treasuring. It is really by such works as these that Romney should be judged, by these and by the brilliant sketches which he left unfinished, rather than by his more ambitious historical subjects, or even the splendid figures painted while he was under the enchantment of that incarnation of healthy animal beauty, Emma Lady Hamilton.

Romney  
and Lady  
Hamilton.


Romney's connection with that famous lady has been probably misinterpreted. Certain it is that many pictures of his have been dubbed "Lady Hamilton" which were painted before the painter had seen her, and all sorts of fables have been attached to others that were really taken from this sumptuous model. Their meeting did not occur till the summer of 1782, when Charles Greville (whose mistress she was) brought her to his studio. As far as Romney is concerned, her conduct was unquestionably correct; but Romney, who was always a little mad, then and there became infatuated with her beauty. Painting from "the divine lady," as he called her, thenceforward became his chief delight. Under the influence of this veritable passion, he poured forth, besides studies innumerable, a whole series of demi-goddesses and saints and heroines, Cassandras and Circes and Magdalens. Much as Romney's fame owes to this connection, it was probably, on the whole, unfortunate for



Lady Craven.



Sketch Portrait of Lady Hamilton.



Study of Lady Hamilton as a Bacchante.



Mrs. Mark Currie.

EXAMPLES OF PORTRAITURE, BY GEORGE ROMNEY.

(National Gallery.)

Romney's development, except so far as it prevented his giving way to the desire, which in later years grew on him, to paint great original subjects at the prompting of his friend and flatterer, the poet Hayley. Painting from Lady Hamilton, or working up old studies of her ladyship, together with a great production of portraits, kept him from carrying out what he called "my system of original subjects, moral, and my own, and one of the grandest that has been thought of," which could hardly have added to his fame. He had long since abandoned all notion of returning to his family. In thirty-seven years he only paid his wife two visits, and it was only in 1799 that, miserable and broken in mind and body, he returned to the uncomplaining woman who had been the nurse of the obscure apprentice of Christopher Steele, and who was now to be the nurse of the greatest living painter in England, when, for three years, he lay paralysed and dying in the home he had so long neglected.

Romney's  
Place as  
an Artist.

It is exceedingly difficult to appraise at its right value the merit of Romney. His popularity in his lifetime was no doubt helped by the sort of revival of neoclassicism which took place at the end of the century; but, on the other hand, he never enjoyed any share of Court favour; he was antagonistic to the Royal Academy and he disliked the company of his brother artists, and was repaid in kind; yet Northcote, the pupil of Reynolds, allows that his master was "not much employed as a portrait painter after Romney grew into fashion." This is all the more amazing when we remember that Romney had no decent training, either of mind or hand, and that he was entirely ignorant of anatomy. "Could art come by impulse," says an academician, writing of Romney, "he would have been a great artist." We are inclined to think that it did so come in his case, and that he was a great artist. It is, nevertheless, true that the lack of other things besides the divine afflatus made him an unfinished artist, solid as some of his work seems, and prevented his influencing for good the generation that succeeded him.

His  
Character.

Romney's character has been, as a rule, harshly dealt with. His conduct to his wife is, no doubt, inexcusable; but his relations with his family, notwithstanding his long separation, remained affectionate to the end. He expended his savings on his brother's outfit to India. His children revered his memory.

His wife never complained. In later life, as the insidious disease of which he died gained ground, his natural moodiness and eccentricity increased, but his friendship with men like Cumberland, Cowper the poet, Flaxman, and Adam Walker, and even Hayley, shows that he must have possessed some endearing qualities. Flaxman, whom he had helped and encouraged as a boy, describes a visit paid to Eartham, Hayley's country house, spent in Romney's company, as follows:—"I had the happiness of living such a fortnight as many thousands of my fellow creatures



*Photo: Walker & Cockerell.*

JOHN FLAXMAN, R.A., MODELING THE BUST  
OF HAYLEY, BY G. ROMNEY.

*(National Portrait Gallery.)*

go out of the world without enjoying." And after the painter's death he wrote:—"In my long attachment to Romney I have felt the powerful charm that attaches a reader of feeling to the Hamlet of Shakespeare." The comparison is singularly felicitous, for in Romney, too, we have the strange brilliancy, the incompleteness, the lack of courage, the moodiness, the indefinable charm, and over all the shadow of madness and an unhonoured grave. The Hamlet among artists—that is Romney.

THE introduction of the field cultivation of turnips and artificial grasses proved the pivots of agricultural improvements. The new system of alternate husbandry proved that farming in a

**B. E. PRO-  
THERO.  
Bakewell  
and  
the New  
Farming.**

circle was a more productive process than the similar method in argument. More stock meant more manure; more manure fertilised and enriched the soil, and trebled its yield; larger crops supplied the means of supporting still larger flocks and herds. Thus the agricultural circle seemed to be capable of indefinite expansion, and those who followed the practices of Tull and Townshend realised fortunes.

But before the full value of the recent improvements could be realised, it was necessary that the live-stock should be also improved. A revolution in stock-breeding was required. The changes in the grazier's art, which were introduced by Bakewell, a farmer of Dishley, near Loughborough, in Leicestershire, produced results even more remarkable than those which flowed from the new farming practices of Tull and Townshend. These changes form the most striking feature in the agricultural history of the period under review.

**The Old  
Standards.**

Up to the middle of the eighteenth century wool had been the chief source of profit to English farmers. Other forms of agricultural produce were raised for home consumption rather than for sale. England was, in the main, still a pasture country; the British farmer took his seat on the woolsack; the fleece was golden; the carcase of the sheep was of little value. As wool-producing animals sheep had been studied, and they were classified as long-woolled, short-woolled, and intermediate. Wool was used either for combing, that is, for stuffs and stockings: or for carding, that is, for coarse and fine cloth. Judged by this standard, the small, white-faced, hornless Ryeland or Hereford sheep were the most profitable, because their fleeces were of peculiar fineness, and Leominster wool commanded the highest prices, while Cotswold wool stood next in the market. If any care was ever shown by individual breeders in the selection of rams and ewes, the choice was determined by consideration for the fleece or by fanciful points which possessed no practical value, such as the colour of the face, the shape of the horn, or the blackness of the legs.

In cattle, again, no true standard of shape was recognised. The qualities for which cattle were valued were not their fattening propensities or their early maturity, but their milking capacity and their power of draught. No attention, except in the north-western counties, as Hartlib allows, was paid to breed.

1784]

Height was the principal object aimed at. The gaunt Holderness breed was, from this point of view, highly esteemed. "The goodness of the soile," says Lawson in his *New Orchard* (1626), "in Howl-, or Hollow-, derness, in Yorkshire, is well knowne to all that know the River Humber and the huge bulkes of their cattle there." "Cattle," wrote Culley in 1809, "were more like ill-made black horses than an ox or a cow. Nothing would please but elephants or giants." Parish bulls were selected only for those qualities in which Obadiah's pet, so strenuously defended by Mr. Shandy, was alleged to be wanting. It was a promiscuous union of nobody's son with everybody's daughter. To country squires, in the reigns of the first two Georges, the standard of excellence was probably that of the famous "Lincolnshire ox," exhibited, as the advertisement sets out, "with great satisfaction at the University of Cambridge" in the reign of Queen Anne. He was "Nineteen Hands High, and Four Yards Long from his Face to his Rump. The like Beast for Bigness was never seen in the World before. *Vivat Regina*" (*sic*).



ROBERT BAKEWELL.

When prizes were offered for the longest legs, it is not surprising that all over the country were scattered tall, raw-boned, wall-sided cattle, and lean, leggy, unthrifty sheep. It must not, however, be supposed that our ancestors were unwise in their generation. Legs were of value when miry lanes had to be traversed, and animals roamed for miles in search of food. Size of bone stood the ox in good stead when it dragged the plough through stiff clays. But a time was rapidly approaching when

beef and mutton would be of more value than power of draught or fineness of wool. Bakewell was the agricultural opportunist who saw the impending change, and knew how to meet it. He provided meat for the million, and, by so doing, contributed as much to the wealth of the country as Arkwright or Watt. Many monuments have been raised in Westminster Abbey to the memory of men who less deserved the honour than the Leicestershire farmer.

**Bakewell.**


Born in 1725, he was barely twenty when he began his experiments in stock-breeding. When Arthur Young, armed with an introduction from the Marquis of Rockingham, visited him in 1760, he resembled in appearance the typical British yeoman who figures on jugs of Staffordshire pottery—"a tall, broad-shouldered, stout man of brown-red complexion, clad in a loose brown coat, scarlet waistcoat, leather breeches, and top-boots." Visitors assembled from all parts of the world to see his farm, his water-canals, his irrigated meadows on which mowers were employed from May to Christmas, his famous black cart-stallion, his bull "Twopenny," and his ram "Two-pounder," or to gather from his lips the principles which are now the axioms of stock-breeding. There were, however, many secrets of his business which he jealously guarded from everyone but the old shepherd to whom they were confided, and it is said that he never sold a sheep to a butcher which he had not previously infected with the rot, lest it should be used for breeding purposes. In his kitchen he entertained "Russian princes, French and German royal dukes, British peers, and sightseers of every degree." Yet he never altered the routine of his daily life. "Breakfast at eight; dinner at one; supper at nine; bed at eleven o'clock; at half-past ten, let who would be there, he knocked out his last pipe." So lavish was his hospitality that, though large sums of money passed through his hands, he died in poverty.

**His Sheep.**

When Bakewell began his stock-breeding experiments, he selected his sheep from the best animals in the neighbourhood, and a guinea, or even half a guinea, procured his choice from the fold. The breed of sheep that he formed was, it is supposed, based upon the old Leicestershire or Warwickshire sheep crossed with the Ryeland. Marshall, writing at the close of the century thus describes the genuine Warwickshire ram in his unimproved

1784]

state:—"His frame large and loose; his bones heavy; his legs long and thick; his chine, as well as his rump, as sharp as a hatchet; his skin rattling on his ribs like a skeleton covered with parchment." The material sounds unpromising. But Bakewell had a well-defined object before him, and he had discovered for himself the principle of selection and the secret of breeding "in and in." He used only those rams and ewes which possessed the points and qualities that he wished to reproduce. His object was to breed animals which weighed most in the best joints, and most quickly repaid the cost of the food that they consumed. "Small in size and great in value," or the Holkham toast of "Symmetry well covered," was the motto of his experiments.



ONE OF BAKEWELL'S SHEEP, BY SCHNEBBELIE.

(Nichols, "*History and Antiquities of Leicester.*")

He saw that the value of the sheep lay not in the length of its legs, but in the size of the barrel, that the bones must be fine, the form compact, and that the true shape for profit was "a firkin on as short legs as possible." As by judicious selection the form, fattening propensities, and early maturity were perpetuated, the breed was established, and Bakewell's "New Leicesters" for a time swept all competitors before them. They were the first breed of sheep which were scientifically treated in England, and, though they were less adapted for the Eastern and Southern counties than other native breeds, they were unrivalled in their own Midland districts.

In 1755 Bakewell had let his rams at 16s. each for the season. In 1789, some six years before his death, a society formed to extend his breed of sheep hired his rams for a single season for 6,000 guineas. The reclamation of commons and the general adoption of roots and grasses have something to say to the



change; but some idea of the effect which Bakewell helped to produce in the art of the grazier may be gathered from a comparison of the weight of sheep and cattle sold in Smithfield Market in 1710 and 1795. In the former year the average weight was, for beeves, 370 lb.; calves, 50 lb.; sheep, 28 lb.; lambs, 18 lb. In the latter year the average weights were respectively 800 lb., 148 lb., 80 lb., and 50 lb.


Bakewell's  
Cattle.

Bakewell also turned his attention to cattle-breeding. But here he was less successful. It was his material and not his principles that failed. His Leicester Long-horns, based upon the Craven Long-horns, proved to be good milkers, but nothing more. It was, however, by his example that other breeds, with better natural qualities, were improved. The Teeswaters, or Durham Shorthorns, of Charles Colling, both for the dairy and the butcher, were to cattle-breeders what Bakewell's New Leicesters were to sheep-farmers. All over the country men followed in his footsteps, adopted his practices, emulated his standard. The formation of flocks and herds became a favourite pastime of the wealthy, and a profitable pursuit for farmers. If Flora MacIvor had not predeceased Bakewell, she might have lived to see the day when country gentlemen might be breeders of cattle without being "boorish two-legged steers like Killancurit." As the New Leicesters had been improved till they held the rich plains against all comers, so the Southdowns for the hills and the Cheviots for the mountains were improved by breeders who followed the example of Bakewell. As the pioneer of stock-breeding, the Leicestershire farmer may be considered, in a sense, the creator of the Southdowns of Ellman of Glynde, or Jonas Webb of Babraham, of the Ketton herd of Colling, the Herefords of Tomkins, or the Devons of Lord Leicester and Mr. Quartly, which, within the next fifty years, were brought to a high pitch of perfection.

G. TOWNS-  
HEND  
WARNER.  
The Pro-  
gress of  
Manufac-  
ture.

MENTION has been made (p. 149) of the fact that it took a number of spinners to keep one weaver in full work, and there is evidence to show that the handloom weavers of the first half of the eighteenth century did not, as a class, work very hard. Their work was, in fact, as a rule remunerative enough to allow them at least one day's holiday a week. Masters of the day, who put

work out among the handloom weavers, supplying the yarn and finding a market for the goods when complete, make complaints of the uncertainty of getting work done to time, and it is further clear that one thing much regretted by the handloom weavers, when the day of factories came, was the loss of liberty. It was not altogether that they were compelled to work more; but they could no longer work when it suited them and leave off when they pleased. Although it was generally more



RIBBON WEAVER AT HIS LOOM.

*(The Universal Magazine, 1747.)*

difficult for a weaver to find yarn than work, the conditions of the two industries were in 1730 fairly in equilibrium. It is evident that if either there was a much greater supply of yarn than could be made up into cloth, or, on the other hand, if weavers could weave yarn much faster than spinners could spin it, there would be a tendency to try and drive the lagging trade, to improve it so that it could keep pace with the other. This is exactly what happened in the textile trades. First, an improvement in weaving gave the handloom a lead. There was a market for cloth; weavers were ready to work, but the supply of yarn, always rather scanty, became quite inadequate. A weaver might have to walk three or four miles in a morning and call on


Spinning  
and  
Weaving  
Inter-  
dependent.

five or six spinners before he could collect sufficient yarn for weft to serve him for the rest of the day. Wits were set to work, and machines were made to spin. These brought up the spinning trade. Yarn was put on the market far cheaper and better than before. So great was the supply that the handloom could not do the required work. Again the spur to invention was applied. If machines could be made to spin, why should they not be made to weave? Accordingly, before long the power-loom was designed, and this enabled weaving to catch up the twin industry that had left it temporarily behind. Machinery called for power. Water-power would do where it could be obtained, but it was not to be had everywhere; wind was altogether too fickle and feeble, horses too expensive; and so came the demand for a power that would work anywhere, and at a cost that left a margin for profit. A premium thus put on the improvement of the old atmospheric engine produced the steam engine, by which industry was finally collected from the villages where the handloom weavers had lived, and from the banks of the streams of Lancashire and Yorkshire, where the first mills had been built, and settled in the towns. It must not be supposed that the progress of the industrial revolution, the sequence of invention, was quite so regular and plain as it has been here sketched. But the outlines of the picture are true. The one impetus was given; and, that done, the invention spread from one process and one trade to others, taking, as it were, larger and larger strides as it went on its way.

Invention:  
Kay's Fly-  
shuttle.

The first in the series of inventors was John Kay, of Bury. He was first engaged in a woollen factory at Colchester, but in 1730 set up at Bury as a reedmaker. His first patent for twisting and carding mohair and twining and dressing thread did not come to much. But in 1733 he took out a patent for the fly shuttle. The shuttle which carries the weft had hitherto been passed from one hand of the weaver to the other on its way through the warp. This was at best a slow process, and made it impossible for a weaver to weave anything but narrow widths. In fact, the commonest width of woven cloths is still three-quarters of a yard, a length fixed by the necessity of passing the shuttle from hand to hand. For wide goods two men were required, who sent the shuttle from one to the other. The essence of Kay's invention was that the shuttle was thrown from

side to side along the race-board by a mechanical device instead of being passed from hand to hand. One hand of the weaver only was required for the shuttle, while the other was left free to beat up the cloth after each throw, and the shuttle would fly across wide cloth as readily as narrow. This invention doubled the weaver's power of work in addition to improving the quality of the work done. Kay's invention was patented, but he was



JOHN KAY OF BURY (ARTIST UNKNOWN).  
(*The Royal Museum and Art Galleries, Salford.*)

not successful in keeping it to himself. The fly shuttle soon became widely used, and the demand for yarn became greater than ever. Kay himself tried his hand at machine spinning, but he was not successful. Nor, indeed, was he the first in the field, for in 1738 Lewis Paul had patented a machine for spinning by a novel method. The method consisted in employing two rollers, the second roller going slightly the faster of the two, and stretching the sliver as it was delivered off the first one. Paul was associated with John Wyatt, of Birmingham, and it is held

Paul and  
Wyatt:  
Roller-  
spinning.


by some that Wyatt was the real inventor. He himself said so, and his son claimed to possess the father's original model made in 1733. Probably Wyatt was only employed to make Paul's machinery; but, anyhow, they anticipated Arkwright in the principle of spinning by rollers. But whereas Arkwright made his machine a practical success, Paul and Wyatt did not. Their machine was not altogether a failure: ninety skeins a day was done by each frame, but the projectors did not find business enough to keep four frames out of five going. And so the problem of supplying yarn satisfactorily still remained unsolved. It is worth notice, however, that Paul was also the first to give to the world the plan of a circular or continuous carding engine. Thus, though he achieved no commercial success, he hit on two suggestions which were developed later into important inventions.

Hargreaves's  
Jenny.

In 1764, however, a handloom weaver named James Hargreaves, of Blackburn, got an idea from a spinning wheel, which, accidentally overturned on the floor, continued to revolve, the thread still remaining in the hand of the spinner. This idea was developed into the spinning jenny, a machine which, as he first made it, worked eight rovings in a row: that is, he multiplied by eight the power of the hand-spinner; and even more than this, for Hargreaves's jenny was a machine that could be worked by children. The jenny had no drawing rollers; the roving was clutched between two bars, which were slowly drawn away from the spindle, while the spindle put in the twist. The machine was, of course, worked by hand, but it was found that Hargreaves's original number of eight spindles could be easily increased. In fact, so many as one hundred could be placed on one machine. Hargreaves used the jenny for himself, but afterwards sold some. Thereon the spinners, who feared that the new machine would throw them out of employment, broke into Hargreaves's house and destroyed the machine. Hargreaves migrated to Nottingham, and there took out a patent and set up a cotton mill; but when he came into litigation his patent was held invalid on account of his previous sale of the machines. Hargreaves died in 1778, without having gained much profit from his invention. But this was not because the machine was a failure. It is true that it did not at first oust the hand-spinners in cotton; but it gradually made its

way, first in the cotton and then in woollen industry, so much so that by the date of the inventor's death there were at work in England 20,000 hand jennies of eighty spindles each.

Hargreaves had overcome one industrial difficulty. He had improved the supply of weft, and enabled the spinner to keep pace with the weaver. But there was another thing he had not



ARKWRIGHT'S SPINNING JENNY, 1769.

(From the Specification at the Patent Office.)

done. It has been already explained that the description "cottons," as applied to the goods of this time, was only partly true. The yarn of the day was not strong enough to be used for the warp, which was accordingly made of linen thread, and cotton used for the weft only. Thus the cotton goods of the beginning of the reign of George III. were composite material, half linen, half cotton. Much, then, was to be gained if cotton could be made fine and at the same time strong. This improve-

**Ark-  
wright's  
Frame.**

ment was the work of Arkwright and Crompton. Richard Arkwright, a native of Preston, began life as a barber. He was a man of vigorous intellect and quick observation, and though not professionally connected with textile industries, his mind was too receptive to allow him to remain uninterested in what was going on around him. There is no proof that he had heard of Paul's invention when he first began, but the principle he used was the same. With the aid of a clockmaker—Kay, of Warrington—he made a model which gave him hope of success. He then applied to a capitalist, Atherton, who offered him the help of a smith and a watch-tool maker. The first machine of the kind, which afterwards received the name of “waterframe” from the fact that it was worked by water-power, was made in the parlour of a house belonging to the Free Grammar School of Preston. But with the fate of Kay and Hargreaves before him, Arkwright had no mind to stay in Lancashire, and he accordingly went to Nottingham.

The principle of Arkwright's spinning frame consisted in spinning by rollers revolving at a different velocity. His machine contained four pairs of rollers, driven by wheel and pinion. In each pair the top roller was coated with leather to enable it to catch hold of the cotton, and the lower one fluted longitudinally. One pair of rollers revolving more quickly than the other, the roving was drawn to the requisite fineness and firmness for twisting, which was accomplished by spindles or flyers in front of the rollers. The yarn thus produced, known as “water-twist,” owing to the fact that it was made by the “water-frame,” was harder and firmer than any produced before. Arkwright pointed out that it was especially suited for warp. In fact, warp is now almost always made of “throstle-spun” yarn (on Arkwright's plan), while the “mule-spun” (Crompton's) is used for weft only. For some time, however, manufacturers were shy of using it. It was first used for stockings, an industry which had its home round Nottingham; in 1773 it was employed for warp in calicoes in place of the old-fashioned linen warp. This, curiously enough, brought it under an Act of Parliament; for Parliament, under the idea that all goods consisting of pure cotton must be Indian, had passed in 1736 an Act to protect British manufacture, placing such goods under a double duty. The Act was repealed in 1774, and in 1775 Arkwright took out a

series of patents by which the whole process of manufacture of yarn, including carding, drawing, roving, and spinning, was carried out by one machine. From working cotton it was later adapted to other industries. Arkwright was no more successful than other inventors in protecting his patent rights. But he



SIR RICHARD ARKWRIGHT.

*(The Royal Museum and Art Galleries, Salford.)*

was a man of energy and business-like habits, and managed to make a large fortune by the application of his invention, although he could not keep the use of it solely for himself. In complete contrast to the success of Arkwright stands the failure of Samuel Crompton. Shy and retiring, he was as unfitted to battle for himself as could well be imagined. When engaged as a young man, near Bolton, in yarn spinning, he was vexed by the necessity of constantly mending the broken ends of the yarn spun on Hargreaves's jenny. He set about inventing a plan to



Crompton's  
Mule.

obviate this. Fear of his neighbours compelled him to work secretly and mostly at night. In 1779 his machine, originally called the "muslin wheel," but afterwards known as the "mule," was complete. It turned out a yarn superior both in strength and fineness to Arkwright's water-twist. This was attained by an adaptation of Arkwright's rollers to Hargreaves's jenny (hence the name, "mule") and the addition of something new, namely, the spindle carriage, which prevented undue strain on the thread before completion. It thus drew and twisted a greater length than the jenny had done. The machine reproduced the action of the left finger and thumb of the hand-spinner, as he held and stretched the sliver while the spindle twisted it into yarn. Crompton's yarn when sold attracted the notice of Bolton masters. The inventor was plagued and pestered for his secret, and unable to keep it to himself, and fearing mob violence, he gave it up in return for promises of a subscription, which, when collected, realised the magnificent sum of £67 6s. 6d. This generosity, were it not pathetic, would be ridiculous; anyhow, it was too much for the unfortunate Crompton, who, soured by failure, turned into a misanthrope, destroying his machines and refusing all offers of assistance. He was naturally not consoled in his sullen retirement by the knowledge that his invention had started a flourishing muslin industry in which large fortunes were made.


The net result of these inventions was to place the spinning business far in front of the weaver in point of productiveness. Hargreaves's, Arkwright's, and Crompton's work had far outweighed Kay's invention. And although it was in the cotton trade that the improvements were first made, they were of a kind that could be applied by degrees to the woollen trade. Consequently, the weaver had his hands full, and spinners had sometimes difficulty in getting their produce off, and the old hand-spinners, beaten both in quantity and quality, found their trade beginning to slip from them. The story of how the weavers again, as it were, caught up the spinners will find a place in the next chapter.

Iron  
Smelting  
by Coke.

The steady retrogression or iron smelting in England is shown by the quantity of iron imported. The amount rose steadily. From 1711-1718 the yearly average was 15,642 tons; from 1729-1735. 25,501 tons; from 1750-1755, 34,072 tons; from

1784]

1761-1766, 48,980 tons. The reason has been already mentioned, namely, the scarcity of charcoal. The Darbys, father and son, had shown that coke could be used to replace charcoal, and the story of the recovery of the iron trade is mainly the story of the spread of this knowledge. The difficulty with coke was to get an effective blast. The trompe, a water-blast used in the Catalan charcoal forge, was not of sufficient power. The earliest blowing



— COAL WAGGON.  
 ("London Magazine," 1784.)



engines were large bellows worked by horse- or water-power, and so arranged, in sets of two or four, as to give a fairly continuous though not a powerful blast. The water-power, where there was no natural fall, was sometimes supplied by one of the early forms of steam engine (p. 426). The first improvement in the blast was due to Smeaton, who built for Roebuck at the Carron Iron Works, about 1760, a cylinder blowing engine. The power, as was customary, was indirect. The engine furnished water which in its turn drove four blowing cylinders. These were 4 ft. 6 in. in diameter, with tightly fitted pistons. There was a valve in the bottom opening inwards to admit air as the piston rose: when the piston fell this valve closed and another valve near the bottom opened into a pipe along which the air was driven. The machine was not altogether satisfactory, as there was no effective

**Improved  
Blast.**

regulator to keep the blast steady ; but the yield of the furnaces rose in consequence from ten or twelve tons per week to forty, and a yearly average of something over 1,500. When it is remembered that the average yield of the charcoal furnaces in England in 1740 was 29½ tons, the progress made is evident. More is to be said of the blast, but it must be deferred until some account has been given of Watt and the steam engine. But even the imperfect engine of the type built by Smeaton was more and more used. By 1788 the yield of charcoal pig was 13,100 tons per annum, this being a decrease of 4,250 tons since 1750 ; while in the same year the twenty-four furnaces using coke yielded 37,000 tons. The charcoal masters affected to disparage the quality of the pig made with coke. Unquestionably the coke-pig was more liable to impurity, and no doubt was sometimes red short (*i.e.* excessively brittle when red hot), from the presence of sulphur. But the coke-pig could be good enough when properly made, for a writer mentions that in 1746 a certain Ford, who was a partner with the Darbys, made iron from ore and coal, both raised in Coalbrookdale, either brittle or tough as he pleased, and soft enough to be used for cannon and bear turning. If this statement is accurate, Ford is entitled to the credit of first using raw coal (for although Dudley speaks of "pit cole," it is almost certain that he coked his coal before using it). But there is some doubt on the subject. The thing likely to strike a casual observer was not the use of coal as distinct from coke, but the use of something that was not charcoal. The second Abraham Darby's charge for his blast furnace was five baskets of coke, two of brays (small coke), one of peat, and then the ore and limestone. The manager of the Coalbrookdale works in 1757 was Reynolds, and in his time raw coal was used, at any rate in part, as the fuel of the blast furnace. It will be necessary to recur to this again in the next chapter. Another important new process was that of casting steel, first discovered by Benjamin Huntsman, of Sheffield. It was believed that the process was complicated, and Huntsman kept his secret for some little time, while imitators tried their best to find it out. The secret was discovered by Walker, of Greenside, a rival founder, who, as the story goes, disguised himself as a tramp and begged to be allowed to sit near the furnace one bitter night for the sake of the warmth. In Huntsman's process the blister steel was broken

Charcoal  
and Coke.

up and melted in crucibles with lids, the heat being kept on till the steel seemed to boil, and after three hours it could be poured



EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY RELICS FROM THE CARRON WORKS.

(From photographs supplied by the Carron Company.)

off into moulds in the usual way. A layer of glass was generally put on top of the steel, but this does not seem to have served for anything but to mislead imitators. Huntsman used excellent materials, and his steel was of first-rate quality; although it was

The  
Carron  
Works.


not at first popular in Sheffield, it was much used in France, and was found to be so good that Sheffield had to take it up in self-defence. The Carron works gave the name to the carronades, "a piece of carriage ordnance cast for the first time in 1779, at the iron works of the Carron Company. Although shorter than the navy 4-pounder and lighter by a trifle than the navy 12-pounder, this gun equalled in its cylinder the 8-inch howitzer." The boring of these cannon was not very exact, for when cylinders for Watt's engines were bored at Carron by the same machinery, Watt congratulated himself if they were not more than three-eighths of an inch out. John Wilkinson, of Bersham, invented an improved machine for boring cylinders true, and executed many orders from Boulton and Watt.

Wilkinson.

Wilkinson is an interesting figure in the iron trade. He was the first of the great ironmasters. His father was a foreman at Blackbarrow. John and his brother built their first furnace near the same place to smelt hæmatite; the concern prospered and the brothers had forges at Bersham, Bradley, and Merthyr Tydvil, becoming the largest manufacturers of their day. They cast the whole of the tubes, pipes, cylinders, and ironwork required for the Paris waterworks. John Wilkinson urged the use of iron so strongly and so incessantly that he was thought "iron mad" to talk as he did of iron bridges, iron houses, and iron ships. But he had the pleasure of proving his critics wrong, for he was, with Abraham Darby (the third), principally concerned in recommending the use of iron for the first iron bridge, the Broseley Bridge over the Severn, cast by Darby at Coalbrookdale, and opened in 1779. And in 1790 he made at his own works in South Wales the first iron vessel ever launched. It was used on the Severn. His "iron-madness" hung by him to death, for he had an iron coffin made in readiness, and used to show it and recommend similar ones to his friends. After all this preparation the coffin, oddly enough, turned out to be a misfit, and Wilkinson's body was interred for a time whilst another coffin was cast.


Coal  
Mining.

The increased demand for coke stimulated coal mining. Between 1700 and 1750 the output of the kingdom rose from 2,612,000 tons to 4,773,828 tons and to 6,424,000 tons in 1780. This increased demand led to the opening in some cases of new mines, but as this is always unremunerative at first, the tendency



COALBROOKDALE IN 1758.  
(From a contemporary print.)

was to drive the pits deeper and deeper. According to a paper in the *Annual Register* for 1769, the deepest mine in England at the time was a copper mine at Ecton Hill in Staffordshire, the depth of the shaft from the hilltop being more than 400 yards. Access, however, was usually gained by an adit, varying in height from 4 ft. to 6 ft., to a central platform for landing the ore, whence the descent to where the ore was got was 160 yards, by ladders, lobs, and cross-pieces of timber let into the rock.



BROSELEY BRIDGE.

(From an old print.)


"In descending from the principal lodgment you pass thirty ladders, some half broken, others not half staved; in some places by half-cut notches or steps in the rock; in others you must almost slide on your breech, and often in imminent danger of tumbling topsy-turvy into the mine." Sixty men worked below, six hours at a shift, for 2d. the hour. The ore was drawn up to the platform by a man working a winch, and then taken along the adit in waggons holding a ton and a half; these waggons had cast brass wheels, and were run in grooves through the adit by boys from twelve to fourteen years of age. The ore was broken up by men, carried by little boys in hand-barrows to the sorting shed, where it was sorted by little girls, then further broken or buckled by women with hammers, and finally washed in the buddle. The price given for it by the smelting houses was from £7 to £16 per ton; when purified and cast into bars it fetched



INTERIOR OF A SMELTING-HOUSE AT BROSELEY, SHROPSHIRE.  
(After a painting, in 1788, by G. Robertson.)



£70 to £90 the ton. Three hundred men, women, and children were employed, women earning by task-work 4d. to 8d. the day, girls and boys from 2d. to 4d. There was constant employment for both sexes from five to sixty years of age. The owner, the Duke of Devonshire, was believed to clear £8,000 to £10,000 annually by it, and employed there all the labouring poor who




MINERS' TOOLS FOUND IN AN OLD COAL-MINE IN FIFESHIRE.

(From a photograph supplied by the Wemyss Coal Co.)

came from neighbouring parishes. The mine was surprisingly dry, the daily work of four horses being enough to keep down the water. But increased depth generally meant increasing difficulties with water. Even the tin and copper mines in the hilly districts of Cornwall, which had first of all been drained by the driving of adit levels, now went too deep for such remedies. Pumps and rows of buckets were used, worked either by horse-power or human labour, or, where possible, by water power. To pump out water was the first use made of the early steam engine. It is unnecessary here to relate the whole story of the way in which the properties of steam came to be understood, but it has been thought better to travel somewhat outside the limits of the chapter in date, so as to be able to exhibit as a whole the various steps of improvement which made the steam engine, even before Watt's time, a powerful and useful machine. The first engine

that calls for notice was constructed by the Marquis of Worcester about the year 1650. He used the pressure of steam in a boiler to raise water to a considerable height. Sir Samuel Morland further developed the same idea, and applied it in the reign of Charles II. to waterworks and fountains. Denis Papin familiarised men with high pressures in his "Digester," which was fitted with his own invention—the lever safety valve. He also used steam to create a vacuum beneath a piston so that atmospheric pressure would make it descend; but he effected condensation by the clumsy device of taking away the fire, so, though his plan was sound in theory, it was hopelessly unpractical. Thomas Savery, in 1698, patented what he called a "Fire Engine," which, though behind Papin's ideas, was of practical use. He published also the *Miners' Friend*, in which he explained his invention and advised its application to clear mines of water. His engine consisted of two vessels communicating with the boiler and also with the well. Steam was admitted and condensed to form a vacuum, whereon the water was sucked from the well into the vessel. Steam was again turned on, and the pressure acting on the surface of the water caused it to close the valve by which it entered and open another valve leading into a pipe, up which it



SAVERY'S ENGINE FOR RAISING WATER.

(After the drawing attached to the specification  
in the Patent Office.)

Savery.


would be forced to a height determined by the pressure used. The two vessels were filled and emptied alternately, and thus a continuous stream of water could be raised to a height. At the first trial Savery's engine threw water to the roof and struck off the tiles. He erected one at Camden House which pumped 3,110 gallons in an hour and burnt a bushel of coal in twenty-four hours. Several of his engines were erected in Cornwall, but when the depth was great it was necessary to employ two or three engines, one above another, and it was impossible to work economically. Besides, the pressure necessary to raise an 80-foot column of water found out weak places in Savery's boilers. Explosions were frequent, and where three engines were in use together, one was generally out of order, thus stopping all three. None the less, the engine set up at Huel Vor was thought an improvement, and sent the miners to greater depths.

**Newcomen.**

Thomas Newcomen, who was a contemporary of Savery's, took the next step. Savery had used no piston. Newcomen's use of it was a great advance. In his engine steam was admitted to the cylinder under the piston, and then condensed; atmospheric pressure caused the piston to fall, and as the piston was attached by a rod to a pivoted beam, with the pump on the other side, the pump was raised. Steam was again admitted, and the weight of the pumping gear pulled the piston up, thus preparing the engine for another condensation and another stroke. The difficulty was how to condense the steam, but by accident it was found that a spirt of cold water thrown into the cylinder was the most effective. Newcomen and his partner Calley set up their first engine at Griff, in Warwickshire, and others at Newcastle-upon-Tyne and Austhorpe. Cornwall then took a number, one with a cylinder of 47 inches in diameter being set up at Gwennap. Improvements were made by Potter, Beighton, and Smeaton, the latter of whom made much more powerful engines. One built by him at Chacewater in 1775 had steam cylinders 6 feet in diameter, and made a stroke of  $9\frac{1}{2}$  feet. The pumps were in three lifts of 100 feet each, and were  $16\frac{1}{4}$  inches in diameter. The cylinder weighed  $6\frac{1}{2}$  tons, and was fed by three boilers. The engine was of 76 horse-power. In 1767 there were 57 engines at work near Newcastle of collectively 1,200 horse-power; and Price, in 1778, says that Newcomen's invention had sent the miners twice as deep, though the engine

1784]

still left much to be desired. "Every fire engine of magnitude consumes £3,000 worth of coals a year." Newcomen's engines were costly from several causes: the vacuum secured was far from perfect; the cylinder was unprotected and lost heat rapidly; but worst of all was the loss of heat due to condensation in the cylinder. In so vast a vessel much water was required—in fact,



NEWCOMEN'S ENGINE.  
(Hunterian Museum, Glasgow.)

the water-jet was usually worked with a 20-foot head—and the costliness of alternately heating and cooling the cylinder for each stroke was excessive. Faulty as the Newcomen engine was, yet it was not a toy. It did work, and that effectively, although expensively. A great mistake is made in thinking that before Watt the steam-engine was of no use in industry. It was limited to one use—pumping, and consequently mainly used in one industry—namely, mining, although the water pumped by


it might be used for other purposes, such, for example, as providing a blast for furnaces.

**Pottery  
and  
Porcelain.**

Pottery is chiefly associated with the name of Josiah Wedgwood; but although he did very much to improve taste and processes, yet there were many others in the field who, though of less fame, yet were doing very good work.<sup>1</sup> It is impossible to give a full account of the numerous firms and the various wares produced, and it must suffice to note the principal processes that were patented, and afterwards to say a word on one or two of the more important firms. In 1744 Heylyn took out a patent for making porcelain and china. His material was "unaker, an earth, the produce of the Chirokee nation in America, the propertys of which are as follows—*videlicet*, to be very fixed, strongly resisting fire, is extremely white, tenacious, and glittering with mica." He gives the proportions to be used. It was then to be kneaded, thrown on the wheel, cast into moulds, or imprinted into utensils. After the first firing, called biscuiting, it could be painted, and then dipped into a glaze, made according to direction, of unaker and a special "glass," and then fired again. In 1748 Frye took out another patent for a certain ware, "not inferior in beauty and fineness and superior in strength" to the ware from the East, known as "China, Japan, or porcelain ware." Frye and Heylyn were concerned in the Bow Works. When the site of what had been Bow Works was dug over in 1869 a great number of fragments were discovered, and these were all of porcelain biscuit; there was no Delft or common earthenware. To return to the patents. White, in 1762, had a patent for crucibles, and the "Count de Laraguais of London" another for a new method of making porcelain ware. Josiah Wedgwood's one patent is dated 1769. It was for the purpose of ornamenting earthen and porcelain ware with an encaustic gold bronze, together with a peculiar species of encaustic painting in various colours, in imitation of the ancient Etruscan and Roman earthenware. But Wedgwood did not care about patenting his new processes. The most interesting patent of the time was that of William Cookworthy. He was the first to make porcelain from native materials. All the porcelain


<sup>1</sup> Details will be found in the Catalogue, by Lady Charlotte Schreiber, of the collection presented by her to the Victoria and Albert Museum.





POTTERY FROM THE SCHREIBER COLLECTION.

*(Victoria and Albert Museum.)*



Exotic Bird (Plymouth Ware).



America (Plymouth Ware).



Spring (Bristol Ware).

POTTERY IN THE SCHREIBER COLLECTION AT THE VICTORIA AND ALBERT MUSEUM.



Jorniah  
China  
Clay.

made in England before his time was either not true hard porcelain, or else was made from materials brought from abroad, either from China or elsewhere, such as the earth from the "Chirokee nation" used by Heylyn. It is said that some of the kaolin used to come from China as ballast, until the Chinese, learning what use it was put to in England, stopped the export of it. But in 1745 Cookworthy, who was established in Plymouth as a wholesale druggist, had his attention called to the question of porcelain. He writes:—"I had lately with me the person who hath discovered the china earth . . . 'twas found in the back of Virginia, where he was in quest of mines, and, having read Du Halde, discovered both the petunse and kaulin. They can import it for £13 a ton." This seems to have started Cookworthy on trying to find the materials in England. He was successful. The two things wanted were "Petunse" and "Caulin," as Cookworthy terms them, the flesh and bones of china ware. "The stone of this Petunse is a species of granite. . . . I first discovered it in the parish of Germo, in a hill called Tregonnin Hill"; and for the kaolin, "There are inexhaustible stores of this Caulin in two Western counties. The use it's commonly put to is in mending the furnaces and fireplaces of the fire engines." He obtained it first from Tregonnin Hill, and afterwards from many places in Cornwall. Cookworthy arranged with the owners of the land for an exclusive supply of the materials, set up works at Plymouth, and in 1768 obtained a patent for the exclusive use of native materials in the manufacture of hard paste porcelain. In 1774 Cookworthy sold his patent right to Richard Champion, of Bristol, who, obtaining an extension of the patent right for another fourteen years, began the manufacture of Bristol china. The extension of the patent was violently opposed by the Staffordshire potters, especially by Wedgwood, who urged that Champion was not the discoverer, but the purchaser, and that the use of native materials should be free to all. These were high principles used to support a poor cause. But there is no doubt that Wedgwood showed shrewdness as well as generosity in refusing to patent his own improvements. Patents bred expensive lawsuits; the best protection lay in good workmanship. If imitation was only inferior imitation, then it was not really

Wedg-  
wood.

formidable. And it was by the quality of his work, the excellence in taste, design, and execution, the novelty of his wares, that Wedgwood made his reputation. Wedgwood was an old name among Burslem potters, for Aaron Wedgwood was in business there early in the eighteenth century. Josiah Wedg-




PLATE OF QUEEN'S (WEDGWOOD) WARE.  
(Schreiber Collection, Victoria and Albert Museum.)

wood was apprenticed there to his brother Thomas in 1744. He set up for himself at the Churchyard Works in 1769, taking on other work as his business grew. In 1762, according to a story which, however, is not well authenticated, he made for the queen a specimen of "Queen's ware," a cream-coloured ware of fine glaze, and received the title of "Potter to her Majesty." His name was made. "It is really amazing," he writes, "how rapidly the use has spread almost over the whole globe and how universally it is liked." In 1769 he opened his new works at Etruria. In 1773 he was making "a composition of terra cotta

resembling porphyry, lapis lazuli, jasper, and other beautiful stones of the vitrescent or crystalline class; a fine black porcelain having nearly the same properties as the basaltes"; and thirdly, "a fine white biscuit ware or terra cotta, polished and unpolished." In 1774 he made a new variety—a fine white terra cotta of great beauty and delicacy, proper for cameos, portraits, and bas-reliefs. This was afterwards worked up into the "Jasper" ware, which had the general qualities of the

basalts, together with that of receiving colours throughout its whole substance. The secret of it lay in the use of cawk (sulphate of baryta) from Derbyshire. Many experiments were necessary before it was perfect, Wedgwood giving his partner formulas in French with his private numbers for the ingredients, and writing: "You can hardly conceive the difficulty and trouble I have had in mixing two tons of this composition, and leaving everybody as wise as they were." In 1785 he invented the jasper dip, by which the goods were left white inside.

But what distinguished



JASPER (WEDGWOOD) WARE.

(Schreiber Collection, Victoria and Albert Museum.)

Wedgwood far more than striking inventions was the immense labour he bestowed on making everything first-rate of its kind. No detail was too small for him, no course of investigation too toilsome, too disheartening, or too expensive. No hint was left neglected. Tools, patterns, designs, all occupied his mind. He sought to employ the best men, and to employ them suitably. He recognised the merit of Flaxman's work, although he wrote to Bentley of him, "It is but a few years since he was a most Supreme Coxcomb, but a little more experience may have cured him of his foible." Flaxman, as a modeller, was indeed valuable, and from 1775 he did a great quantity of work for Wedgwood.

1784]

His first bill to Wedgwood for three vases and twenty "Bas Relievos" (mostly classical subjects) was only £15 9s. 3d. His prices did not remain so moderate for long. But Wedgwood cared more for quality than for cheapness, and always employed Flaxman for his best things. Great as was the benefit conferred on the ceramic art by Wedgwood's new processes, the benefit from the high standard of work which he set was incalculably greater.



DERBY WARE: AT A COUNTRY FAIR.

The years 1742-83 cover a period of much activity in the china and earthenware trades, apart from that created by Wedgwood at Burslem. The Derby China Works were begun by Andrew Planché in 1750, but soon came into the hands of William Duesbury, who, in 1763, sent forty-two boxes to London, and sold the contents for £666 17s. 6d. Duesbury purchased and carried on the Chelsea works from 1770-1773, gradually removing the business to Derby. The Chelsea works were closed in 1784. Duesbury also



DERBY WARE: A PEEPSHOW.

(Schreiber Collection, Victoria and Albert Museum.)

Derby and  
Chelsea  
China.

purchased the Bow and Lambeth works. In 1774 the Derby works employed near a hundred men and boys, and several of the painters earned a guinea and a-half a week. There is an interesting catalogue of one of Duesbury's sales in 1781, at which the top price (£30 9s.) was fetched by "an elegant Seve-pattern complete desert-service, enamel'd with roses and rich mosaic and gold border." The Worcester Porcelain Company was founded by Dr. Wall and others in 1751, and at first chiefly imitated Oriental productions. Whether printing on china with transfers



A SPOON TRAY IN WORCESTER PORCELAIN.

(Schreiber Collection, Victoria and Albert Museum.)

from copper plates was discovered at Worcester or not, it was practised there in 1757. Sadler, of Liverpool, obtained a patent for the same process in 1756, but a poem in the *Gentleman's Magazine* of 1757, speaking of a printed portrait of the King of Prussia on a Worcester cup, says:—

“What praise, ingenious Holdship, is thy due,  
Who first on porcelain the fair portrait drew!”

An extempore addition to this appeared in 1758:—

“Handcock, my friend, don't grieve, though Holdship has the praise;  
’Tis yours to execute—’tis his to wear the bays.”

Of these three claimants it seems that Sadler has the best claim. He was an engraver, and the idea of transfer-printing was suggested to him in the following way. He used to give spoilt prints from his plates to his children, and they were in

the habit of putting them on the broken pieces of pottery which served them for toys. Sadler, in partnership with Green, tried experiments, and according to his statement on oath, printed at Liverpool, in 1756, 1,200 earthenware tiles in six hours. The process was further developed, and Wedgwood sent a good many things to be printed by Sadler. Duesbury also practised printing at Derby in 1765, and the use of transfers soon became general.



MUG, WITH PORTRAIT OF GENERAL WOLFE (SADLER'S WARE).

(Schreiber Collection, Victoria and Albert Museum.)


ALTHOUGH the first canal in England was made to convey coal from the Duke of Bridgewater's pits at Worsley to Manchester, yet no industry in the end benefited by the canals more than pottery. Canals offered a better and cheaper means of carriage than any previously existing; but with many things, such as coal and iron goods, railways, offering increased speed to compensate for higher rates, have since competed successfully with the canals. But for all china and earthenware goods, canal carriage is still the most convenient, as there is much less risk of breakage. England was backward in the matter of canals. Not only Holland, but also France was far ahead in the matter. A little had been done in England towards improving the navigation of rivers. In 1656 Francis Mathew had proposed to connect the Isis and Avon by a canal, and the same idea flitted through other men's minds, but nothing much was done, although during the first half of the eighteenth century the beds of the Mersey, Irwell, Weaver, Aire, Calder, and Sankey were improved. But the rates charged were high: 3s. 4d. a ton was charged for the shortest distance by the Mersey Navigation Company. To send by river from Manchester to Liverpool cost 12s. per ton; road carriage cost 40s., and the price charged

**G. TOWNS-  
HEND  
WARNER.**  
The Canal  
System.

The Duke  
of Bridge-  
water and  
Brindley.

for carrying coal from Worsley to Manchester more than doubled the price of the coal at the pit's mouth: this is perhaps hardly remarkable when we remember that coal was sent in paniers on horseback, 280lb. being the usual load. The Duke of Bridgewater obtained two Acts (1759-60) granting him powers to construct a canal from his pits at Worsley to Manchester. The work was planned and carried through by the ingenuity of the Duke's engineer, James Brindley. Brindley began work as an apprentice millwright, and was thought an unusually clumsy one. But although he could scarcely write or draw at all, his cleverness with all kinds of machinery was most remarkable. He saw what was required in a piece of work, the difficulties in the way, and the practical way to overcome them. His habit was, when he was puzzled, to go to bed and think it out; and so, often without plans or estimates, he worked on, attaining success by his natural shrewdness. He at once showed that he was capable of dealing with the problem of canal navigation. His work was simple and strong. He aimed at securing long stretches of level water, and at using as few locks as possible. When required he kept them close together. He was careful to exclude flood water. As far as possible he kept clear of rivers. To him water in a river was a furious giant overturning everything, whereas "if you lay the giant flat on his back he loses all his force whatever his size may be." Thus he proposed to the Duke the bold plan of avoiding the toilsome descent and ascent by locks involved in crossing the Mersey by carrying the canal on a bridge or aqueduct over it. His plan was ridiculed, and an engineer called in to advise condemned it, saying: "I have often heard of castles in the air; but never before saw where one of them was to be erected." But though the idea was novel in England there were aqueducts in plenty to be seen abroad. Barton Aqueduct was built, and the whole canal completed, to the confusion of the theorists, in 1761, and the price of coal in Manchester fell from 7d. per cwt. to 3½d. Not content with this, the Duke set Brindley to work at once on another canal connected with the first at Longford bridge and going to Runcorn. This was also successfully carried through, at a cost of £220,000. Long before it was finished the Duke was at his wits' end for money. On one occasion he sent his steward round to collect scraps of rent in advance

to pay his workmen. Brindley got 2s. 6d. and latterly 3s. 6d. a day. He was as economical as he was illiterate. "Ating and drink, 6d.," is a common entry in his diary; or again, "masuring a Cros from Dunham to Warburton Mercey and Thalwall 3s. 11d., Dunham for 2 diners, 1s. 3d., for the man, 1s. at Thalwall, 1s. 2d. all Night Warington." He could neither spell his employer's title nor his own employment: "to masuor the Duks pools I and Smeaton," and again "novocion," is his



THE DUKE OF BRIDGEWATER'S NAVIGATION ACROSS THE IRWELL.  
(*"The Oxford Magazine,"* 1777.)

first attempt at navigation, and he seldom got nearer than "novogation."

Brindley's spelling, however, did not affect the commercial success of the canals, and other persons soon desired to have a share in the advantages they offered. Before the Duke's canal was finished, Brindley was making surveys for a canal through Staffordshire, a plan which ended in the Grand Trunk Canal. This started from Runcorn, ran through the salt districts of Cheshire, thence through the Potteries, and then southward to Rugeley, where it turns to the east, passes Burton, and joins the Derwent at Wilden. From here there was river communication to the Humber. The project was supported by Josiah Wedgwood, who himself cut the first sod. The whole length, including branches to Birmingham and the Severn, was 139 miles. The advantages gained by both salt and pottery

The Grand  
Trunk  
Canal.



Effect  
on the  
Pottery  
Trades.


trades was enormous. But the pottery trades benefited the most, for they used much material brought from long distances such as flints from south-east England and clay from Cornwall and Devon. Even coal and lime had come like the rest, the last few miles on horseback. And in sending out goods in the same way the risk of breakage was great, and the cost of carriage almost prohibitive, being as high as 1s. per ton per mile. Three pot wagons went from Newcastle-under-Lyme and Burslem weekly to Bridgnorth, and carried about eight tons of pot ware at £3 per ton. About a hundred tons went the same journey on horseback at £2 10s. per ton. Salt was carried over the country in the same fashion. About a hundred and fifty pack-horses went from Manchester to Bridgnorth every week with woollen and cotton goods. The Grand Trunk Canal changed all this. From Etruria to Liverpool a ton went for 13s. 4d. instead of 50s. From Wolverhampton to Liverpool the cost was £1 5s. instead of £5. Wheat, instead of costing 20s. a quarter to go one hundred miles, now went for 5s. Once started, canal making went on apace. Brindley, before his death in 1772, himself planned 365 miles of canals (adding the Wolverhampton, Coventry, Droitwich, Oxford, and Chesterfield canals to those mentioned), and he was consulted about many others in all parts of the country. The movement spread to Scotland, where, among others, the Forth and Clyde and Crinan canals were constructed. Between 1790 and 1794 eighty-one canal Acts were obtained, and the country was covered with a network of waterways, some urgently needed, others less required. Tales of enormous profit brought in the speculator, and haste and carelessness led to much waste of money, and in some cases to panic and ruin. But these evils were accidental; the gain to industry was immediate and permanent.

Growth of  
the Canal  
System.

Brindley  
and En-  
gineering.

Brindley's work is remarkable because so much of it was original. He had to plan and train his workmen to execute what had not been done in England before. Barton Aqueduct is but one sample of the soundness of his judgment. Equally remarkable are the big embankment across Stretford Meadows, the way the canal was carried across Sale Moor Moss, the great tunnel 2,880 yards long at Hare Castle, contemptuously alluded to by the scoffers as another of Brindley's "Air Castles" until they were silenced by the success of the undertaking. It was

thought that the embankment at Stretford would never hold the water ; but Brindley knew the virtues of puddled clay. He showed also that powdered lime dusted on its layers would hold a wet embankment from slipping ; and that gravel or sand could be made water-tight by shaking it together with iron bars and washing down loam or soil. The canal was prevented from sinking in its passage across Sale Moor Moss by driving timber to form a supporting case or frame till the work was complete, and thus building up the embankment bit by bit. As soon as a



ENTRANCE TO THE HARECASTLE TUNNEL, BRIDGEWATER CANAL.

(From a print of 1785.)

section of the canal was finished it was used for the conveyance of earth and material for the rest. For this he used double boats with a trough supported between them, capable of carrying seventeen tons. Trap doors in the bottom of the trough allowed the stuff to be discharged in an instant. The boats were conducted from the canal into caissons placed at the proper points, their contents let go, and thus the work was carried on in a way that saved, when compared with carting, 5,000 per cent. Floating carpenters' shops and floating forges saved time and trouble. Brindley made good use of the steam engine of his day, especially in keeping down the water while cutting the Hare Castle Tunnel on the Grand Trunk Canal, and he also called into existence the sturdy race of navigators or "navvies" as we know them, men accustomed to hard work, with rough and ready skill

The  
"Navyy."

in dealing with large masses of material. Thus later, when the time for railways came, there was no lack of workmen with the knowledge necessary to construct them.

A. L.  
SMITH.  
Finance  
and  
Economics.

The  
National  
Debt.

At the end of the Walpole period of peace and good finance, the National Debt was about £46,000,000. The two wars of "Jenkins's ear" and the Austrian succession raised it to £77,500,000. The Seven Years' War cost over eighty millions; the American War, ninety-seven millions. Thus, in 1783, the funded debt stood at £212,000,000, the unfunded being £19,000,000 more. The nineteen years of peace, 1748-56, and 1764-75, had effected but an insignificant reduction. In 1737 the Sinking Fund had been complacently described as "a certain way of paying off all our debts." But this fund consisted only of surplus balances, and its normal yield (£1,250,000 in 1749, £1,800,000 in 1772) was not always forthcoming. Some saving was effected by Pelham's conversion of the four per cents. in 1750 to three per cents. by 1757. But there were periodical alarms about this "gigantic and intolerable burden of indebtedness"; as in 1755, when it was urged in debate that a new war might well cost us fifty millions, and that no one could say where the capitalists would be found who could lend so much, and where the funds on which to borrow it. On the other side it was often pointed out that our Parliamentary good faith brought to our feet the treasures of all the moneyed men of Europe; that we could raise loans at half the interest that it cost the French; that we could still borrow at 3 per cent.; and that governments must consider not merely the maxim of "paying your way," but also what the people are able and what they are willing to bear. As Henry Fox said, a land tax of 4s. in the £ on a true assessment would have brought in enough to make both loans and custom duties superfluous; these, therefore, were the penalties of popular ignorance and impatience of taxation, which had rejected poll taxes and hearth taxes, and would submit to no increase in excise or in window tax or land tax. Heavy as the load was, it was in the nature of mortgages on newly acquired estates; and the nation could afford to pay out of its victory over its commercial rivals and the consequent enormous expansion of its own resources. It was no idle boast

1784]

when Burke, in 1767, offered to prove that England was the most lightly taxed State, and its revenue the best constituted, of any that ever the world had beheld.

In 1763 the fourteen North American colonies contained a

Taxing the  
Colonies.




GUINEA OF GEORGE III., 1761.

population just over two millions, of whom three-quarters were whites. That is, the colonists were then nearly one-third as numerous as the inhabitants of England and Wales. But their rate of increase was so much more rapid than the

home rate, that Malthus (p. 655) was able to prove from it the capacity of population to double itself in less than twenty-five years. The total volume of English trade had increased enormously in the eighteenth century; and yet the proportion which English trade with these colonies bore to the total had increased in a far greater ratio—from one-twelfth to one-third of the whole. They might seem ripe for independence, yet Franklin was doubtless

correct when, in his evidence before the Commons' Committee, he said that nothing could have been better than the temper of the colonies towards England before 1763; that they cost nothing to govern them but



SPADE GUINEA OF GEORGE III., 1787.

pen, ink, and paper; and that they were led by a thread. "To be an Old England man was in itself a kind of rank." So Burke defined their attitude as one of "unsuspecting confidence in the Mother Country"; the ties which bound them were light as air, but strong as links of iron. The war just concluded had been fought in Europe for America, as Pitt claimed. But America had done its part. The colonists

had raised 20,000 troops, often equipping more than the quota imposed. They incurred debt to the amount of two and a half millions; and the charges for paying-off this debt were equivalent to taxes proportionately as heavy as those in England. Massachusetts alone had supplied 7,000 men and a warship, and paid £80,000 a year. But beneath these appearances of loyalty and cordiality there was already much tension of feeling. They inherited all the English jealousy on the point of taxation. Their popular government and free religion, their passion for legal studies, their pride as slave owners, created "a fierce spirit of liberty." They had long felt the tyrannical sway of the policy of the Navigation Acts (IV., pp. 362, 621), which were only endurable while evasion was connived at. These Acts allowed the colonists to dispose of that which the Mother Country could not take, and without which they could not pay. A great empire had been established and a huge national debt incurred "for the sole purpose of raising up a nation of customers"; a policy unintelligent even in a people of shopkeepers. America must send all its products, except rice, sugar, and skins, to England alone; it was refused leave to export hats or woollens, to work steel, or even to restrict the import of slaves. It is true that this was part of the general European view of "plantations"; England was less oppressive and illiberal than any other colonial power. It is true, also, that bounties were given to encourage the American production of indigo, hemp, flax, timber, etc. Moreover, the "non-enumerated" articles (grain, salt meats, fish, rum, etc.) could be exported freely if in English ships. A system of drawbacks, too, often let Continental goods be sold cheaper in America than in England. Above all, a vast illicit trade with the French West Indies had grown up unchecked. Smuggling was universal and almost recognised. It was not so much the system itself as it had worked hitherto, but the attempt to enforce it as a reality introduced by Grenville, whose mistimed conscientiousness led him to read the American despatches, that caused the colonies to revolt. He saw England saddled with a debt of ninety millions for a "colony war." He saw the lever which the Crown held in the fact that it appointed and paid the customs officials, and could try revenue cases in its Admiralty Courts without a jury. But he failed to see how the war had relieved the colonies from fear of France; how much they made



The  
American  
Dispute.

of the distinction, convenient if illogical, between port duties for the regulation of commerce, and internal taxes for revenue imposed by an assembly in which they felt themselves unrepresented. His Stamp Act (p. 236) was a ludicrous failure and had to be repealed. Yet it is difficult not to condemn the Americans' attitude alike on technical and legal grounds, and on the broader ground of patriotism, despite the rhetoric of Chatham, the splendid inconclusiveness of Burke, Camden's citation of "laws of nature," and the shifting pleas of Franklin. Was America to contribute nothing to the navy, to ignore the debt, and yet to decline even sharing in the cost of a local military force? Could Whig statesmen accept the view that the colonies should make what grants they pleased direct to the Crown? Was the proposal to admit their representatives to Parliament in the least feasible? Certainly English statesmanship was to the last degree vacillating and provocative, just as English public opinion was first blind and then obstinate. But it is impossible to believe, however honestly such men as Washington strove to believe, that anything could have long averted the now inevitable rupture. To accompany the Repeal of the Stamp Act by an Act declaratory of Parliament's right to tax was no doubt a fatal conjunction of two irreconcilable policies. But the declaration was almost necessitated by the growing irritation against America, by the fact that Parliament had already twice committed itself to the principle, and by the Ministry's inability to carry the repeal except at this price. At the time all seemed well. The colonies had won their practical point. After the violent storm there was at once, said Burke, an unparalleled calm. But beneath this calm there were still all the elements of danger. Opinion in America was ripening fast. The feeling in England was growing so fast that a humiliating surrender had been made. In 1767 Charles Townshend, "driven on by the courtiers," as Burke puts it, began to try that impossible task, at once to tax and to please.

"To render the tax palatable to the partisans of American revenue, he made a preamble stating the necessity of such a revenue. To close with the American distinction, this revenue was external or port duty; but again to soften it to the other party, it was a duty of supply. To gratify the colonists it was laid on British manufactures; to satisfy the merchants of Britain the duty was trivial, and (except that on tea, which touched only



THE REPEAL OF THE STAMP ACT.  
(From a contemporary satirical print.)



the devoted East India Company) on none of the grand objects of commerce. To counteract the American contraband, the duty on tea was reduced from a shilling to threepence. But to secure the favour of those who would tax America, the scene of collection was changed, and with the rest it was levied in the colonies. What need I say more?" (Burke.)

The estimated revenue of £40,000 was to pay salaries of judges and officials in America. But "the fine-spun scheme had the usual fate of all exquisite policy." The Americans saw in it a vista of corruption and jobbery, placemen and courtier-judges. They saw the whole scheme of taxation revived, and they retaliated by repudiating the distinction between taxes and duties; by clamouring not merely for no taxation, but also for no legislation, without representation; and by disowning the authority of Parliament, though still professing to obey the Crown. The net product of Townshend's precious scheme was £295 the first year. True that its indirect effect was that tea worth 6s. per lb. in England was sold in America for 3s. But to the Americans this seemed a clumsy bribe to make the assertion of right pass, and to cover the menacing preamble. They formed unions to take no tea from England; other imports they received; and Lord North gave another instance of the short-sightedness of statesmen when, in 1771, he announced that the troubles were over, and in 1772 that there was the fairest prospect he had ever known of a long peace. To this prophecy the Boston Tea Party, December, 1773, was the answer. The 3d. on tea, which the colonists refused to pay, was not unjustly compared to the 20s. ship-money which Hampden refused to pay. This duty had been retained with the view of aiding the East India Company; without their sale of tea in America, the company was in danger of bankruptcy. Such were the results of the mercantilist policy upon the Eastern and the Western worlds.

The Tea  
Ships at  
Boston.

No wonder that some bold thinkers argued that the extension of colonies was a mistake, that they were a mere weakness, and the supposed trade benefits a mere delusion. So wrote Dean Tucker; and Adam Smith declared that our American trade regulations were "a violation of the most sacred rights of humanity"; that our monopoly of trade in the colonies was a dead loss to us; and that could men only believe it, separation would be best for both; while, short of

1784]

that, the best plan was to free their trade and give them representation in Parliament. Burke and Chatham would not hear of separation, and considered the scheme of colonial representation in Parliament impracticable; they believed in conciliation. Taxation was to be by colonial grant; if some refused to grant, then and then only was the compelling power of the Crown to be applied. "Leave America to tax herself; keep up no more than the old trade laws; return to the policy of the past 160 years; repeal the tea duty. This was just the prevalent opinion of the English commercial classes, to whom experience had made clear the folly of taxing America, but not the folly of the trade monopoly in America. Unfortunately, the flame in America had now spread from taxes to monopolies; while feeling in England was one of vindictive anger mixed with contempt. With the meeting of

Congress, September, 1774, "the die was now cast," as the King said, correcter in his foresight than was Washington, who at this very time disbelieved in separation. Nor did the majority of Americans see whither they must drift: they thought their agreements to reject imports from the home country would cut off two-thirds of its trade and bring it to the verge of ruin; they were misled, too, by the past vacillations in English policy which had seemed to shift with every mail from America. But the general feeling in England now was that which Gibbon expressed when, writing at the time of the debate in February, 1775, he declared it to be the crisis of both our trade and our empire.



MACARONI MAKING AS AT BOSTON IN 1774.  
(From a contemporary satirical print.)

Adam  
Smith and  
Economic  
Policy.


Adam Smith had criticised severely the taxation system then prevailing. The land tax was unequal in assessment, and fixed in valuation. Tithe was absurdly unequal, and a discouragement to improvements. The window tax ought to be an inhabited house duty. Ground rents should be taxed. An income tax he thought would be unendurable, and would frighten away capital. Licences he approved; but the shop-tax proposed in 1759 would have been thoroughly bad. Stamp duties he pronounced to be both oppressive and essentially unequal. The necessities of life were taxed as if they were luxuries: salt was made to pay 300 per cent., leather 10, soap 25, candles 15, coals about 60. Corn bounties, high import duties on corn and cattle, were equally bad. Many articles had been driven out of use by prohibitory duties; "for in the Customs, two and two often make not four but one" (Swift). The system of bounties and drawbacks, perquisites and privileges, made the expense of the Customs 30 per cent. of their net produce. It would be better to draw the bulk of this revenue from a few main articles—sugar, rum, tobacco, tea, coffee, china, spices. We should aim not at monopoly but at revenue, and should feel our way by experiment. Smuggling should be obviated by an extended warehousing system. Above all, the raw materials of our manufactures should be imported duty free. The malt, beer, and ale duties ought to be turned into a malt tax, which at a less rate would produce more than they did, and beer and ale would be cheaper.

It could only be said that the English system, with all its defects, was better than that of other European countries. The interior commerce of Great Britain, the inland and the coasting trade, were "almost entirely free." Not only was there no *taille*, as in France; no excise on bread, as in Holland; no duty on all sales, as in Spain; but there was none of the monstrous division into fiscal provinces, the government monopolies, the farming-out of taxes, which in all their stupidity and cruelty were so marked elsewhere.

Effect  
of the  
"Wealth of  
Nations."

It is sometimes said that the "Wealth of Nations" did not exert its full practical effects till a generation after its date of publication. But this is inaccurate in regard to its effects on fiscal policy. These effects were striking and immediate.

The book was at once used as a mine of suggestions for fiscal novelties and reforms, such as the tax on menservants, 1777, the rating of inhabited houses, the tax on posting and the malt duty, 1779, and many others. Above all, the simplification of the Customs by Pitt in 1784, and his reduction of the monstrous



CARPENTERS' HALL, PHILADELPHIA.

(Where the first American Congress met.)

duty on tea from 119 to 12½ per cent, were the initiatory steps of a great fiscal reform, for which he confessed himself indebted to Adam Smith, though the Great War threw back the completion for some forty years.

A suicidal colonial policy and a policy crippling to progress at home were the results of the "Mercantile Theory," which had dominated the economic field for two centuries (III., p. 493,

**The  
Mercantile  
Theory.**

IV., p. 626). This theory represented the development of national spirit and national rivalries consequent on the break-up of the medieval idea of a united Christendom. It applied on a larger scale the medieval scheme of restrictions and regulations of commerce and industry. It is not quite fair to regard the theory as one which identified wealth with money, for its best upholders were careful on this point. But in an age of expanding trade, of great wars with their calls upon the Treasury, of the discovery of ever new "funds" on which to borrow, it was easy to exaggerate the importance of the amount of money circulating in a country at a given time; to speak of it not merely as the index but as the cause of prosperity; to make it the test of a foreign commerce, whether it brought money into the country; and to measure everything by a fallacious "balance of trade." Men were very apt in the course of their reasonings to let land, houses, and consumable goods slip out of their memories, and talk of the amount of gold and silver as if it were the sole object of a nation's activity. Adam Smith found it quite necessary to point out that the natural course of trade would bring us all the specie we want, just as it does all the wine we want; that buying and selling imply each the other; that money must, and does, run after goods; that excess of imports means a return on investments; that nations, like individuals, can only grow rich by producing more than they use.

The Mercantile Theory had by his time passed out of its cruder stages, when it sought its object by prohibition of export of specie, by fixing legal rates of exchange, or by making foreign traders spend their receipts in purchasing native goods. The discussions on the theory had even suggested, however timidly, the fruitful ideas of freedom, of "nature," and of the interests of the community.

**Protection.**

The final form which the theory took, the idea of Protection, had been itself considerably modified by the manifold experience gained in the eighteenth century. The landowners' corn, cattle, and wool had been protected both by import duties and by bounties on export. The manufacturers' cloth and iron goods had been protected against foreign and colonial competition. But it was coming to be felt that commerce should be a bond of union between nations, not a source of discord; that British prosperity was not due to these restrictions, but in spite of them;

1784]

that to allow free imports would no more ruin England than it had ruined Holland ; that success had not attended "the erecting of the sneaking arts of underling tradesmen into political maxims for the conduct of a great empire."

It was pointed out that France should be regarded not as a rival, but as a market, all the more valuable by its proximity; that the interest of a nation was to have all its neighbours as rich as possible ; in fact, that the wealth of one nation was bound up with the wealth of other nations. Adam Smith declared roundly that the corn bounty checked the growth of population, stunted the home market, and in the long run diminished the production ; while it cheapened English corn for the Dutch, and so helped their artisans to undersell ours. He showed how the bounty on herring busses had killed the boat fishery, raised the price of herrings, and invited pernicious speculation. When he went on to argue further that the mercantile system had sacrificed the consumer to the producer, had looked to the interests of a small group of traders instead of the general interest of the whole nation, he could find his instances ready to his hand in recent and familiar history. His attack on the system was, moreover, assisted by momentous changes in the economic world of the time. America had just refused to be made any longer the tool of the Mother Country's narrow mercantile policy. The rise of a new race of men had put an end to the political domination of the landowners. Machinery and factories had broken down the old apprenticeship Acts and corporation privileges. Agriculture had become a science. A new spirit had appeared in Poor Law administration. In every direction the ideas which had prevailed since Tudor times were beginning to be discredited. The old alarms—of Dutch or French outstripping us in trade, of the growth of debt proving to be an intolerable burden, of the sources of public revenue becoming exhausted—had pretty well passed away.


Overthrow  
of the  
Mercantile  
Theory.

A time of expansion had come, a time of buoyancy and confidence. The old view of trade and industry as a struggle of nation with nation, class with class, was giving way to the more modern view of the harmony of economic interests, the co-operation of individuals towards one common end, the social optimism which has since been so rudely shaken. The minds of men were unconsciously ready for the great lesson which is the

Defects  
and Merits  
of the  
"Wealth of  
Nations."

one main thesis of the "Wealth of Nations"—that of natural liberty. That men are by nature free and equal is also the axiom of the American Declaration of Independence of 1776. So that the same year saw the death-blow given to the Mercantile Theory and to its last and worst product, the Colonial System. In fact, the fortress Adam Smith attacked had already been undermined. His work was being done for him. For this reason, as well as on account of his debt to Hume and Anderson, to Tucker and Massie, to Quesnay and Turgot, he is not to be called the creator of political economy. There are striking defects in his book, such as the mistakes about capital and rent and price; and the two erroneous views which he got from the French physiocrats, that much necessary labour is "unproductive," and that in manufacture "Nature does nothing, and man everything." Another defect is his failure to grasp the fact that economic theory and economic institutions are closely related to their surroundings—a fact which disarms his criticism of the mercantilists, not of its logical cogency, but of much of its historical justice. Above all, he is hardly conscious what large assumptions he makes in his use of the terms "Nature," "competition," "labour," "rent," without strict previous definition. He takes for granted that "an invisible hand" so leads men in their individual interests that these all converge in the common weal, and he fails to note how little of this harmony is found when it comes to the distribution of wealth, and how a nation may produce wealth while degrading its workers and creating class hatreds.

But, for all this, the value of the book can hardly be exaggerated. It consists largely in its practicality. He was writing, not for students only, but for statesmen and financiers and business men. He saw the great need of the age was demolition; that the great hope of the immediate future lay in the maxim that the individual can judge his own interests best. But he could admit exceptions—banking, education, the Navigation Acts, a duty on wool export, a temporary monopoly to joint-stock companies. He was wise enough to be an opportunist, and to be prepared to wait; indeed, he declared that to expect entire freedom of trade in Great Britain was as absurd as to expect an Oceana or Utopia. His book is full of acute practical suggestions. No wonder Pulteney said, in 1797, "It is converting this generation, and will conquer the next." What



THE BALANCE OF CREDIT, 1772.  
(From a satirical print.)



also aided it was the arrangement and plan of the book, so informal and unpedantic; its combination of deductive and inductive method, so well fitted to be the source of an historical as well as of an abstract school of economics; the broad view it takes of human life, so contrasted with "the economic man" of some later writers. It is remarkable that while his great aim was the demolition of abuses, he should have succeeded also in constructing so much that has proved permanent; and that, practical writer as he was, the one thing of supreme importance in him should be his contribution to the theory of his subject; for it has been noted that it was he who first showed how "value" measures human motive—that is, how much of human activity is measurable, and therefore open to science. Much of his influence was due to the exact date at which his book appeared—early enough to administer the *coup de grâce* to the old system of obstruction and to champion the cause of land and of labour, but not too soon to ride on the advancing wave of a new industrial epoch.

**A. L.  
SMITH.  
Labour  
and  
Pauperism.**

GILBERT'S returns gave the cost of the Poor Law about 1784 as two million pounds; about 1742 it had been over six hundred thousand pounds, *i.e.* it had increased six times as much as the increase of population. Moreover, this alarming increase had been now gathering force for twenty years.

What were its causes? There was one sapient class of politicians and pamphleteers who opined, with certain grand juries, that it was all due to "the habitual luxury and idleness of the poor," or their "profligacy," or to gin-drinking, or to ale-houses. Arthur Young traced it to the pernicious habit of tea-drinking. A more serious cause had long ago been indicated by Defoe, when he noted the absence of a pauper class in the districts where domestic industries prevailed. But the domestic system was coming under the control of capitalism; the knitting frames at Nottingham and Leicester, the looms at Manchester, were owned by a few masters. The "manufacturer" class became differentiated from the agricultural labourers; and with the severance each class was more exposed to the dislocations of industry and violent fluctuations of trade due to the Continental wars. Nor could these disturbances find their natural adjust-

1784]

ment; the Settlement Laws still checked the mobility of labour, preventing the labourer from taking his services to the best market, and the employer from getting the labour he wanted.

"It was harder," as Adam Smith puts it, "for a poor man to pass the artificial boundary of a parish than an arm of the sea or a ridge of high mountains." Overseers, by merely refusing a certificate, had thus the power, practically, to "imprison a man for life," as was remarked by Hay in 1750 and Burn in 1764. The Statute Book itself mentions that sick persons were often removed, to the great danger of their lives, perhaps only to be taken back after appeal. By the agency of these senseless laws "close parishes" were made possible. In a parish where one man owned all the land, he could clear it of cottages, and throw the cost of his poor labourers upon the neighbouring parishes.

In the general opinion of contemporaries, enclosures were often a contributory cause of pauperism, and were one reason why it was so much worse in the South. Enclosures, no doubt, added enormously to the product of agriculture; but Massie, Arthur Young, and Eden all agree they were too often carried out with utter disregard for the interests of the poor. Not only did the enclosures of commons deprive the poor of valuable rights; but also enclosures in the sense of the substitution of "severalties" for the old "champion" system admittedly led to the consolidation of farms, the eviction of small holders, and so, by a circuitous sort of historic justice, to the ultimate increase of poor rates. This was particularly the case where the consolidation was accompanied by the conversion of arable into pasture. In the end, of course, enclosures added to the general wealth of the country, and thereby increased the demand for labour. But in the meantime they degraded small holders into landless labourers, "who, seeing no opening towards advancement, become regardless of futurity, spend their little wages as they receive them, without reserving a pension for their old age; and if incapacitated from working by a sickness which lasts a very short time, inevitably fall upon the parish." It is a significant fact that in 1774 the Elizabethan Act was repealed which had aimed at securing to every cottage its four acres of ground attached.

Effect of  
Enclosures.

But indubitably the chief cause of the advance of pauperism in this period was the rise in prices as compared with wages.

**Prices and  
Wages.**

The average London price of wheat 1781-84 was 47s. 8d. a quarter; the average from 1743-80 was 31s., according to the tables given by Eden. The low prices, rising wages, and general plenty of the first half of the eighteenth century had been followed by a quarter of a century in which prices tended to rise but wages did not. But from 1774 a general concurrence of testimony shows how fatally wages were lagging behind the now fast-rising prices. Howlett, in 1787, computed that in the fifty years preceding wheat had risen from an average of 32s. a quarter to 45s., while the pay of labour had only gone up 2d. in the shilling. On the other hand, Eden declared ten years later that wages in country districts had doubled since 1737. But in fact, as Arthur Young found on his tours in 1771-2, and as Adam Smith wrote in 1776, there were the widest differences in wages in different districts. Agricultural wages averaged 10s. 9d. a week twenty miles from London, but 6s. 3d. at 110 miles distance, and even 5s. 2½d. in some cases—these figures refer to the Southern counties. The lowest agricultural wage found by Young was 4s. 6d.—this was in Lancashire. The East and North-east had the highest rates. Among artisans the Newcastle coal workers earned 15s. a week; the iron workers of Sheffield, the potters of Worcester, the Wakefield weavers, the West Country wool-workers, got good wages; but the weavers of Lavenham received only 5s. 9d. He admits that the rise in prices since 1762 had begun to hit the labouring classes, though he declares that as yet it was only superfluities that they had had to retrench. But not only was wheat in 1767-8 nearly double what it stood in 1759-62, meat, butter, etc., were dearer too; and salt, soap, candles, and leather were now or soon brought under contribution for the Seven Years' War and the American War. In 1773 a quarter of wheat would cost a Gloucestershire farm hand ten weeks' labour; nowadays it would cost him between two and three weeks. It is, however, urged by Eden that the price of wheat is no fair criterion of the prosperity of the masses, unless wheat is the common and indispensable food of the people. The well-known writer of tracts on the corn trade estimated in 1764 that not half the people habitually eat wheaten bread; rye, oats, and barley were used by the rest. But it is clear that the use of wheaten bread was fast spreading; rye bread and barley bread began to be "looked upon with a sort of horror," and labourers

1784]

would say they had lost their rye-teeth. The years of scarcity after 1762 affected all grain. And these years' prices were only the forerunner of an "unparalleled advance" (Eden). It is certain, on the whole, that before 1784, for the poorer agricultural labourers with families, a terrible and hopeless struggle had already begun. Eighteenth century society was soon to commence paying a heavy price for its settlement laws and corn laws, its extravagant wars, its neglect of education, and heaviest of all for its belated remorse and its ill-considered attempts at reparation.



FRANCIS MASERES, CURSITOR BARON OF THE EXCHEQUER.

*(After Charles Hayter, 1815.)*

Between the severe Vagrancy Act of 1744 and Gilbert's Act, 1782, there is a marked change in the tone of literature and political discussion on the subject of the poor, a change which gives warning that an era is opening of philanthropy and of sociology. When Fielding, in 1753, proposed to leave the impotent poor to charity, and to force the idle to work at wages assessed, he also wanted work provided for the unemployed as stated in the Act of 1601; and he sums up with this reflection "All will allow that the poor are now ill-provided for and worse governed . . . their sufferings are less observed than their

**Attempted  
Remedies.**

misdeeds . . . they starve and freeze and rot among themselves, but they beg and steal and rob among their betters." In a similar spirit Massie, writing in 1758, and Burn in 1764, criticised the system severely and justly; the latter adds a criticism of current proposals of reform (and one which is at least as applicable at the present day as it was 140 years ago)—that most of them ignore the lessons of the past, and propose plans that have already been tried and found wanting; that most of them attempt too much at a time. Burn's own remedies, besides the repeal of the Settlement Acts, were firstly, the supervision of overseers by a paid head-overseer for each group of parishes; secondly, the making almsgiving as penal as begging. One reformer makes an observation the irony of which is seemingly unintentional, "I do most solemnly declare I look for the same humanity hereafter among parish officers as among other men."

Old Age  
Pension  
and In-  
surance  
Schemes.

It is a truism that history shows us that nothing is new. In social history this is at least one side of the truth. It is interesting, therefore, to find a century ago schemes for compulsory insurance—labourers were to be made to provide themselves old age pensions and funds in case of sickness. It is also interesting to find that the criticism then passed on such schemes was that the labourer could do better for himself, as it was, through the existing friendly societies. Is not this still the case?

All this attention attracted to the Poor Laws finds its parallel also in the legislation of the period. In 1753 a Bill was brought in for an annual census and annual poor-law returns. Though this failed to pass, yet important returns were moved for and obtained in 1776 and 1786. There were Acts passed in 1761 and 1766 to put pauper children on a register and to board them out in the country. Howlett estimated that these Acts saved annually the lives of 2,000 such children in London. Unfortunately, an Act of 1756 had ordered that admission should be free into the Foundling Hospital, and in consequence the number received there had gone up from 100 to 4,000.

Gilbert's  
Act.

By other Acts parish apprentices were to be free at twenty-one instead of twenty-four; new rules were made as to apprenticing boys to the Navy, and as to the conduct of hospitals and penitentiaries; and overseers were to be punished for paying the poor in bad money. Above all, Gilbert's Act was passed in 1782. This important statute, so often misunderstood, has more than

1784]

one aspect. Gilbert introduced three Bills: one to make houses of correction more effective; a second, for the better relief and employment of the poor; a third, against vagrants. Only the first two were passed. One clause of the new law encouraged the union of parishes, a point for which the reformers had been labouring since 1722. The number of parishes which availed themselves of this power was not great—there were only 924, grouped into 67 incorporations; but the way of future progress had been pointed out. Another clause checked the letting out of the poor to contractors; this was a salutary regulation. Another forbade taking the able-bodied into the workhouse; this proved a fatal step, undoing all the use of the “workhouse test” imposed in 1722. This was backed up by other disastrous provisions; finding work for the poor near their own homes was a blunder of the first magnitude and a sham already exposed by Defoe and many others; supplementing wages from the rates was the destructive “allowances” system; empowering the justices to appoint visitors and paid guardians was doing a good thing in a bad way, for the action of the justices, even before this, had amply exhibited the mischief of unfettered and irresponsible interference.

Gilbert's Act, then, was a measure which, by giving money Its Effects. to the able-bodied, violated the principle of the Elizabethan Poor Law, and one which undid the good effected by sixty years of vigilant if harsh administration. It fell hopelessly into the confusion between the poor, in the sense of the labouring classes, and the “impotent poor,” “the poor in very deed.” Being an optional measure, the falsely benevolent clauses were very generally adopted, the wholesome provisions neglected. But withal, partly by its good points, partly by the very way in which it opened the flood-gates to a deluge, it contained within itself the germs of the great reform of 1834.

From the Settlement Act of 1667 there had been a century which might be described as the reign of the overseer. It was natural that there should then set in a reaction, even to a somewhat short-sighted benevolence. This movement of reaction is traceable throughout the greater part of the eighteenth century; victorious in principle from 1782, it became the undisputed practice after 1795. It consists of two parts: a new spirit towards the poor, and a series of new

methods for carrying that spirit into effect. The new spirit was good, the new methods were bad. There is no reason why, because we must condemn "allowances" and "colleges of industry," we should not admit that somehow or other wages had to be raised, that some check on industrial unscrupulousness was already called for, and that any régime was preferable to unbridled overseerdom.

Trade  
Unions  
begin.

Among many deep-rooted ideas bequeathed to the eighteenth century from medieval times was that of the need for a fixity of wages. This fixity was supposed in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries to be secured by the periodical assessments of wages by the Justices in Quarter Sessions in each county. But these assessments were about 1740 becoming obsolete; one made in 1725 was at the end of the century published as an historical curiosity. The attempt to fix wages was taken up by the workmen, who combined in trade unions to maintain a minimum wage, as the employer and governing classes had since 1350 combined to maintain by legislation a maximum wage. In this respect trade unions are analogous to medieval guilds. A main object of the guild system was not to leave prices and wages to be settled by competition, but to keep up the standard both of workmen and work. The place left vacant by the decay of the guilds was in this respect occupied by the new trade unions. But<sup>1</sup> it is a mistake either to trace their descent historically to the guilds, or to make them (as is often done) a resultant of factories and machinery. The factory system may be conveniently dated as beginning in 1785, the year when Arkwright's patent for the water-frame expired, and when Boulton and Watt made the first application of steam power in a cotton mill. Trade unions, however, date from much earlier in the eighteenth century: from the time, in fact, when the old rigid restraints on labour by means of assessments, settlements, apprenticeship, and municipal privilege were evaded and ignored, and from the time when the growth of industrial capital made a deep line between employers and employed. Thus, in tailoring, as capital was needed to set up shops, there appear marked divisions of classes—masters, cutters-out, and sewers, the last "as poor as rats." In 1720 complaint was made to Parliament

The  
Factory  
System.

<sup>1</sup> Sidney and Beatrice Webb: "History of Trade Unionism," i.

1784]

that the journeymen tailors, to the number of 7,000, had combined to raise wages and reduce hours. In 1744 further complaint was made that the law passed in 1720 to fix a



THE TAILORS' STRIKE, 1763.

(From a contemporary print.)

maximum wage was not observed; and the same complaint was made in 1767. So in the wool manufacture, the yarn-spinning, the cloth-weaving, the cloth-dressing were done in cottages; but "the capitalist generally owned the yarn, the loom, the cloth, as much as he did the mill where the cloth




was filled or the warehouses in which it was stored for sale." Petitions to Parliament against combinations of combers and of weavers in Devon and the West began as early as 1717. As the domestic system in the North gave way, Arthur Young tells us, these combinations spread also there; and it is said there was by 1741 a woolcombers' union of the United Kingdom acting partly as a friendly society, but partly to keep up wages and to keep out "blacklegs." So, again, in the hosiery manufacture; the frame-knitters had formed a strong union by 1753. The case was similar in the cutlery trade and among the silk weavers.

**Changing  
Conditions  
of Labour.**

The general rule, that revolutions arise not when matters are at their worst but when prospects begin to improve, no doubt applies here. The early trade unions indicate to us in what trades the workers were well paid and high spirited. The curriers, hatters, and woolstaplers, the brush and basket makers, and the calico printers of the time formed each a small privileged industrial ring, protected by the laws and the customs of apprenticeship, and by the sympathy of Parliament, against any lowering of wages;<sup>1</sup> e.g. the Act of 1756 to ratify "a scheme or table for piece-work wages" of the clothiers of the Western Counties. But between this time and the year of the publication of the "Wealth of Nations," Parliament had been converted to a diametrically opposite policy by arguments that seemed irresistible in each case. The case of the Midland framework knitters may be taken as typical: the story is told in evidence taken before the House of Commons. In their trade charter the old Apprenticeship Statute (5 Eliz. c. 4) was left to the wardens of the craft to administer. It was consequently neglected. The masters took many apprentices and almost no journeymen; for £5 was often paid by a parish on every boy apprenticed out. In 1710 the workers appealed to the wardens to carry out the Act: when the appeal was in vain, riots occurred which took the form of frame-breaking; which, therefore, in 1727 was made a capital offence. From 1740 onwards there was "sweating" of the most modern type in Northamptonshire. Profits were high, wages very low; and there was a great influx of women's and children's labour. The Midland Association of Framework

<sup>1</sup> Webb, *op. cit.*, i.



THE WEAVERS IN AN UPROAR.  
(From a satirical print of 1765.)

Knitters (a large trade union) petitioned Parliament in 1778 to fix wages, which had sunk to 6s. a week. It was shown in evidence that the wages had fallen in the last twenty years, while the prices of food and other necessities had risen; that while the value of a frame was between £6 and £8, the rent paid on it was from 1s. 3d. to 2s. a week, *i.e.* from 50 to nearly 70 per cent.; that a workman who bought a frame for himself was boycotted; that it was the frame-owners' policy to let out as many frames and as little work as possible. The workmen were on the verge of starvation. The one argument that was allowed to outweigh all this was that competition prevented the owners from paying more; the trade would be driven abroad. In spite, therefore, of petitions from Towkesbury, Godalming, London, Westminster, Derby, and the Midland centres of the trade, in spite of the riots in Nottingham, things went on. Frames were poured upon the market; apprentices were taken in droves; strikes became frequent. But there was no remedy till the Factory Acts. It was the same story in other industries. Employers proved, or seemed to prove, to helpless Parliamentary Committees that it was suicidal to limit the number of apprentices, to insist on a seven years' term, to interfere with the use of machinery. Once, indeed, the Commons summoned to their aid a venerable prejudice. They passed, in 1773, the first of the "Spitalfields Acts" (confirmed in 1782 and 1801), empowering the justices to fix wages for the silk workers for the protection of this industry from the competition of France. Adam Smith's doctrines came therefore just in time: he could point to accomplished facts, and supply the theoretic basis for a policy that had just been forced, bit by bit, into legislative recognition. In 1777 the apprenticeship rules were repealed as regarded the manufacture of hats, though the Act of Elizabeth as a whole, including the fixing of wages by assessment, was not formally repealed till 1813-14, nor the Spitalfields Acts till 1824.

The battle between employers appealing to free contract and competition and workmen appealing to medieval survivals was a foregone conclusion. Adam Smith points out how the masters had all the advantages on their side: they had the statutes against combining to raise the price of work, but none against combining to lower it; they could combine more easily;

1784]

they could starve out the men in a few weeks; the men's movements, he remarks, "generally end in nothing but the punishment or ruin of the ringleaders."

In these circumstances what could the workmen do? Their next aims must be Factory Acts and repeal of the laws against combinations. But before they could move effectively in this direction, it was necessary for the isolated associations within each trade to unite and acquire the solidarity of a general "labour movement." Trade unions, as it has been well put, had to become a comprehensive trade unionism. These steps belong to a later period.

FOREIGNERS laughed at the English for their love of travel, and called desire to quit their native land the English "*Maladie du pays*." The qualification for the fashionable "*Dilettanti Club*" (1734: p. 361) was a knowledge of Italy. In 1786 Walpole writes: "France, Nice and Switzerland swarm with us; gaming has transported half." Fashion, idleness and illness took many others, and that in spite of the many real hardships all travellers had to endure, especially travellers by sea.

MARY  
BATESON.  
*Social Life.*

Fielding's account of his voyage to Lisbon (1756) contains a graphic description of passenger life on board ship. Having determined to leave London in search of health, he at first wished to go to Aix-les-Bains, but could hear of no ship sailing, within any reasonable time, to Marseilles or any other neighbouring port. Accordingly, he took passage for himself and his wife and daughter in a merchant vessel, "with excellent accommodation for passengers," including separate "*state-rooms*." As there were no landing-stages anywhere, Fielding, who had lost the use of his limbs through the progress of his disease, suffered terribly in getting aboard. There was a long delay in the Thames, due partly to the numerous holidays of the custom-house officers, which made it impossible to clear the ship, and to many other causes. Meanwhile Fielding was tapped for the dropsy, in order to show the man who was to act as "*steward, cook, butler, sailor, and surgeon*" how to do it if occasion arose on the voyage. Before the final departure from England a month elapsed, spent in waiting for winds in the Channel. The vessel was in collision on two successive days.

Travel  
by Sea.



MEMBERS OF THE DILETTANTI SOCIETY, BY SIR JOSHUA REYNOLDS.  
(By permission of the Dilettanti Society.)

[1742-1784]

Smollett had painful experiences, in 1763, when he crossed the Channel to go to Nice for the winter. At Dover he arranged with the master of a packet-boat to go to Boulogne for five guineas. The cabin was so small, the beds so dirty and inaccessible, that the family decided to sit up all night. Next day the master played them the usual trick when he refused to land them, and made them get into an open boat a league off shore. As the Boulogne watermen claimed the right to carry all passengers on shore, the Smolletts had to get into another boat in a very rough sea, and to "gratify" all three crews. Again, coming from Flushing to Dover, Smollett paid his passage of one guinea on the understanding that he should have a bed. But there were only eight beds for sixteen passengers. At all ports, too, it was a hard matter to land or to embark till the beginning of the nineteenth century, when Rennie began to improve harbours and make landing-stages. The packet-boats were now used by all classes; there were but few private yachts.

Travel  
by Land.


Foreigners arriving in England thought that the English custom-house officers were very humble, as they did not search the passengers' pockets or linen-bags; but many fees had to be paid for the redemption of luggage. Foreigners, as a rule, testify that, though everything was very dear in England, the same prices were charged to foreigners as to the English. The charges at Dover and on the road from London to Dover were notoriously high. To escape a Sunday in Dover a Frenchman, Grosley, in 1772, paid a guinea for a seat in a "flying-machine," carrying four passengers, and drawn by six horses, which ran in defiance of the law against Sunday travel. The party were much stared at, but by travelling on the day of rest they escaped the "collectors of the highway," and saw only such as were dangling upon gibbets at the roadside, fully dressed, with wigs upon their heads.

Roads.

The road from Dover to London is not one of Arthur Young's four good roads. He praises only the piece from Salisbury to Romsey, the Great North Road from London to Barnet, the road to Chelmsford, and a small piece of new road in Wales. All the rest it would be "a prostitution of language to call turnpikes"; in turn he calls them vile, execrable, execrably vile. He complained especially of the cutting of "grips" across the road, which let the water off, but also caused many an

overturn; the grip was a favourite method of draining in Norfolk and Suffolk, where he found not one mile of good road.

When a duke proposed to journey into Sussex, in 1746, word was sent from London that keepers and persons who knew the holes and sloughs should come to meet his Grace, with lanterns and long poles to help him on his way. Long journeys from the north were best performed on horseback, for from Glasgow to Grantham there was no turnpike, only a narrow causeway with



THE COACH DRIVERS IN 1770.

(From a political satire on Pitt and Dute.)

soft unmade road on each side, a pack-horse way. In 1760 the coach from Edinburgh to London left once a month, and took sixteen days for the journey, over a considerable part of which there was no turnpike. Whenever new turnpikes were made, they were violently resisted, as the toll was considered an unjust exaction. It was made felony to remove a toll-bar, but it was not easy to protect a long line of road against systematic attack.

It has been estimated that 452 Acts for making and repairing roads were passed in the period 1762-74, yet the engineering of roads remained a dead art in England. When a blind carrier proposed to contract for a portion of new turnpike his tender was accepted, because it was the lowest; professional engineers did not undertake such work. John Metcalf, or Blind Jack of **Knaresboro'**, as it happened, was a genius, and performed his

contract admirably. But he invented no new method, and no real improvement was effected till the beginning of the nineteenth century, when a new school of engineers proposed radical reforms.

Palmer's mail coaches, started in 1784, reformed to some extent the postal service, hitherto conducted by boys on post-

Mail  
Coaches.



SILVER CUP PRESENTED TO JOHN PALMER.

*(By permission of the Corporation of Bath.)*

horses. Palmer, the lessee of a theatre in Bath and of one in Bristol, found that the mail took three days to do a journey he often did in one; so he proposed that the Post Office should arrange a coach service. The scheme, at first declared impracticable, was found to work well. The first to run did the journey from Bristol to London in fourteen hours. In 1792 sixteen mail coaches left the General Post Office daily, and to see the start was a City sight. The coach carried only five passengers, four inside and one out, and was accompanied by an armed guard. The robbery of mailbags then became a thing of the past.



In the same year another important postal reform was effected, when letter-carriers were put into uniform for the first time, wearing a scarlet cloth coat, with blue lapels, blue linings of padua, blue waistcoat, and hat with a gold band.

Inns and  
Food.

To an Englishman coming home from abroad the English inn, with its "twopenny prints, salt-cellar, and boxes to hold the knives," seemed very luxurious, but the *sumnum bonum*, says Horace Walpole, is small beer and the newspaper. The English landlord's complaisance was found a pleasant change after French rudeness; Smollett observes that in France everyone is complaisant except the publican; in England it is *vice*



TOKEN COMMEMORATING JOHN PALMER.

*versa*. Arthur Young's interesting lists of the meals he got and the prices he paid show that the traveller was not then, as now, afflicted by a too great uniformity in items and prices. He tells of suppers

at eightpence a head; of mutton-steaks, ducks, tarts, and cheese, mushrooms, capers, walnuts, and gherkins for two shillings. At Scarborough he found the New Inn very cheap, but very dirty, and had cold ham, chicken, lobster, tarts, anchovies, and cheese for one-and-fourpence; coffee or tea, sixpence. Newcastle he enters as civil but extravagantly dear—a boiled fowl, oysters, and one woodcock, half-a-crown a head; Carlisle, good—a broiled chicken, a plover, plate of sturgeon, tarts, mince pies, and jellies, eighteenpence a head; Penrith, good and cheap—roast beef, apple pudding, potatoes, celery, potted trout and sturgeon, a shilling a head; Kendal, good and very cheap—a boiled fowl and sauce, a roast partridge, potted char, cold ham, tarts, and three or four sorts of foreign sweetmeats, eightpence each, for three people. Anchovies, carp, and sturgeon constantly recur. When bread is charged there is an indignant entry. The inns got dearer as London was approached. At Oxford he found the Angel very dirty and

1784]

not obliging; the tap of the Mitre appears to have been patronised chiefly by dons. Moritz, the German pedestrian, has left a graphic account of the night he spent there, and of his conversation in Latin with the learned company he found assembled. Moritz was fond of walking, and had not much money to spend, so he resolved to see England on foot. Everywhere he met with ridicule, compassion, or abuse; he found himself walking in a country where no one walked for pleasure. When he resolved to pay the charges of a good hotel he was generally refused admittance; wayside inns shut their doors upon him too. Great was his delight when he heard himself called "Sir," not "Master," and on rare occasions he found good cheap quarters, paying only a shilling for supper, bed, and breakfast, and fourpence for service. Beer made him very ill, but he found it absolutely necessary to drink healths everywhere if he hoped to obtain the host's good will. Writing of London, he complains of the half-boiled or half-roasted meat, of the cabbage-leaves boiled in plain water, of the sameness of the vegetables, for there are no hotbeds except at the country seats of gentlemen. The world was waiting for Dr. Johnson's cookery-book "on philosophical principles," and meanwhile used Mrs. Hannah Glasse or one of the many new publications issued about the middle of the century, some by ladies, others by the French cooks of noblemen. In the food of the poor the difference between North and South was especially striking. Southerners ate nothing but bread and cheese, and, perhaps, once a week meat baked at the baker's. In the North, soups and many preparations of oats and of potatoes were eaten, and, fuel being cheaper, more scope was allowed to cookery. The prices of food varied from county to county, but an average price for bread was 2d. a pound; butter, 6d.; beef and mutton, 4d.; and cheese, 3½d. In London bread was 2½d. to 3d. in 1782; butter, 11d.; beef, 8d. Milk was 3½d. a quart; sugar 1s. a pound.

In fashionable circles the dinner hour was five. The Court attendants dined then, had coffee handed afterwards, tea served in the eating-room at eight, and supper at eleven. The king dined at two, the queen and princesses at four, and the middle class at three. Breakfast was a light meal; only thin bread-and-butter and toast were eaten. Breakfast parties began to be given at midday at Ranelagh and in private houses, when


Hours of  
Meals.

it was a matter for surprise that fish, cold chicken and ham, and other solids should be eaten. The Universities alone clung to the old fashion. In 1752 the Oxford dinner hour was reluctantly advanced from twelve to one.

#### Beverages.

All classes drank tea; even the poorest had it at least once a day. In 1741 about 750,000 pounds were entered, and paid the tax of 5s. a pound, but what the poor drank was smuggled stuff, often of very poor quality. In 1745 a great reduction in the tax on tea nearly stopped the contraband trade; but the policy was reversed, the tax increased, and tea was run everywhere. In 1795 the customs on spirits gave a return of about £31,000 on


rum, half as much on Geneva (gin) and brandy; the Portuguese wines paid £430,000; the Spanish followed with £87,500; French wines and Madeira paid about £10,000 each; Canary and Rhenish, £1,000 each. By the Eden Treaty Pitt reduced the duties on French wines, and in six years the consumption rose from 100,000 gallons to 683,000; but when the war broke out these wines were again heavily taxed, and the consumption declined.



ROSEWATER DISH OF 1750.  
(Trinity College, Oxford.)


#### Smuggling.

The commodities most smuggled were tea, coffee, tobacco; French wines, rum, and brandy, which in 1735 were paying duty at £1 per gallon; muslin from the West Indies, lace, lincens, cambrics from France. The "free-trader" was repaid if he saved one cargo out of three; and if the reports of Parliamentary Commissions do not exaggerate, he frequently saved all, and built fine country houses out of the proceeds. The smugglers, armed in bands of from fifty to a hundred, loaded waggons and pack-horses on the open beach, and met with no opposition from the customs officers. In six months, 1,835 horse-loads of tea and 1,689 of wet and dry goods were landed on the Suffolk coast, and were removed by armed convoys of smugglers. About 2,000 hogsheads of spirits were run annually on the coast of Hants, Dorset, and Devon, and it took the customs officers nine



years to capture as many. "The great store-house of all high-duty goods" was the Isle of Man, whence the goods were despatched in large wherries, which generally outsailed the custom-house sloops, to Wales, Ireland, and Scotland.

Even Adam Smith confessed to a weakness for smuggling, and nobody was above bargaining to have a pipe or a hogshead "put in his cellar" at a low figure. But smuggling on a large scale was not carried on without bribery, perjury, informing, violence and murder. The deeds of the Hawkhurst gang in 1748 exceeded all others in brutality. One of their cargoes of tea had



THE OLD RED LION INN, BAKE.

been captured and taken to Poole custom-house, and, in a night attack, the leader of the gang, Thomas Kingsmill, recovered it. It became known that a Customs officer, Galley, and a shoemaker, Chater, would give evidence identifying the offenders. They were thereupon caught by the gang, tied to one horse, and flogged till they fell under it. Galley died under the lash; Chater did not, so his eyes and nose were cut out, and he was made to walk noosed into a well that he might hang himself.

**Crime and  
Police.**

Crimes of violence throughout the first half of the eighteenth century were believed at the time to be dangerously on the increase. Smollett says that "thieves and robbers were now become more desperate and savage than they had ever appeared since mankind was civilised." The law itself set the example if human life and suffering were held cheap, but to us it now appears that the law had not kept pace with the development of society. Not till 1783 was the procession to Tyburn abolished, and the drop used to hasten death by hanging. Johnson, it is true, was angry at these changes, and thought that the "age was running mad after innovation"; but the majority agreed with Horace Walpole that the country was little better than a shambles, and that a change was needed.

Although the capture of MacLean relieved some anxious minds, everywhere it was the feeling that "his profession was no joke." No doubt the London police, before Fielding set his reforms on foot in 1750, were inefficient, and 2,000 watchmen and patrols, "aged in general, often feeble and half-starved on the small pay they received," could not protect all London properly; but though the streets at night were unsafe, houses were safe as they had not been before. By the use of paid informers Fielding broke up one of the worst gangs of street robbers, and in 1757 the nuisance was said to be entirely suppressed. But the roads in the suburbs were not yet safe. In 1781 Sir Horace Walpole, when driving with a lady to an evening party at Twickenham, was attacked by a highwayman. The lady had presence of mind enough to hand him a purse containing nothing but bad money, which she carried with her for use on these occasions.

**News-  
papers.**

The popular outcry about the increase of crime was, to a large extent, the work of news-writers. In spite of the Stamp Act, the sale of newspapers steadily increased, till the number of

stamps issued to newspapers amounted in 1753 to 7,411,757 for a population estimated at about 6,200,000. The news-writer—Johnson's "man without virtue who writes lies at home for his own profit"—could control and guide public opinion, not only in London, but in every provincial town with its own Mercury. The "folio of four pages" contained many advertisements, a small amount of gossip, much ridicule of fashionable life, and some poetry; often no reviews of books or leading articles. It



THE LORD MAYOR AND ALDERMAN OLIVER IN THE TOWER.

(The "Oxford Magazine," 1771.)

depended generally for its intellectual side on the letters of correspondents.

The *Gentleman's Magazine*, started by Edward Cave, a printer, in 1731, was intended to collect within its pages the essays and intelligence contained in the four hundred sheets which the London and provincial press threw off monthly. In 1732 there were added reports of parliamentary debates, giving the initials and final letters only of the names of the speakers. But in 1733 the Commons passed a resolution of "high indignation" against all reporters of their proceedings, and the *Gentleman's Magazine*, with its rival, the *London Magazine*, had to make the debates appear imaginary.


Reports of  
Debates.

The weakness of the Bute ministry made it possible for Wilkes to publish libellous attacks on the Government, which appeared in the *North Briton*, so called in opposition to Lord Bute's paper, the *Briton*, worked by Smollett. The failure of Lord Grenville's prosecution of Wilkes, though it turned on another issue, encouraged writers to bolder expressions of opinion. In 1767 the Letters of Junius began to appear in a leading daily paper, Woodfall's *Public Advertiser*, and in 1771, at Wilkes's instigation, the question of the publication of debates was brought to a head. Several London journals agreed to print notes of the speeches with the speakers' names. Thereupon Colonel Onslow, the "little cocking George, the paltry, insignificant insect" of the reporters, who had made the subject his speciality, complained to the House of the printers. Some of the printers refused to obey the order of the House to attend at the bar; a proclamation for their capture was issued, and Wilkes took advantage of this to arrange a conflict between the City authorities and the House. A recalcitrant printer was apprehended according to the order of the proclamation by a friend acting in collusion, and the two came before Wilkes himself as a City alderman. He discharged the prisoner, and arranged that a countercharge for false imprisonment should be brought against the friend. The Lord Mayor and one of the aldermen concerned were ordered as members of the House to attend in their places. They went, accompanied by crowds of enthusiastic supporters, made their defence against the charge of breach of privilege, and were committed to the Tower. From this time the publication of debates was still technically a breach of privilege, but after one more contest reporting was tacitly allowed. There was, however, no separate accommodation for reporters, note-taking was still prohibited, and the Strangers' Gallery was repeatedly closed.

**Opposition  
to Reform.**

The development of journalism aided the spread of information amongst all classes, but there were party ends to serve, and alarms were easy to raise. Never at any time was the country more subject to senseless 'scares and crazes than in the prosy middle of the eighteenth century. The very placidity of the social atmosphere seemed to make small reforms loom large and fearful. Walpole's ministry was nearly wrecked by his sensible excise proposal, which was ultimately quietly adopted

(pp. 164, 500). Pelham's ministry raised a storm of opposition by proposing to reform the Calendar, to prevent clandestine marriage, and to allow Jews to prefer bills of naturalisation. The last measure was repealed in the following session (p. 230). But the House accepted Chesterfield's Bill without opposition, not foreseeing what the popular feeling would be.



DR. BRADLEY, ASTRONOMER ROYAL.

(By permission of the Royal Society.)

The Julian Calendar, accepted in England, was founded on the erroneous supposition that the year consists of 365 days and six hours, that being eleven minutes in excess of the mean solar year, and the estimate of the lunations was also inaccurate. The errors had been fully worked out by the fifteenth century, but it was not till Gregory XIII. was Pope that the Julian Calendar was corrected to the Gregorian or new style in all Roman Catholic countries.

The  
Calendar



In 1751 the Julian first of the month was the Gregorian twelfth. The Bill proposed to accept the new style with the Gregorian method for suppressing the intercalated days. Lord Macclesfield, afterwards President of the Royal Society, helped Lord Chesterfield to prepare the Bill, which was carefully arranged to save as far as possible all confusion in payments due on fixed days in the year. Eleven days between Wednesday, the 2nd, and Thursday, the 14th of September, were suppressed. The further confusion between the legal year, beginning March 25th, and the calendar year, was also rectified. The legal year was made to begin on January 1st, and the Government quarter-days were fixed accordingly. The calculations were made by the Astronomer Royal, Dr. Bradley (p. 328), who died ten years later, at the age of seventy, of a lingering illness, the nature of which was somewhat obscure. The common people believed it was a judgment of Heaven for his impious proposal to change the days on which the saints had their festivals.

The Marriage Act

The practical details of Lord Hardwicke's Marriage Act, 1753, (p. 230), were not so skilfully planned as those of Chesterfield's Act for the Reform of the Calendar, but popular opposition was excited more against the principle of public marriage than against those clauses of the Bill which were needlessly severe. Even in 1768 Miss Burney wrote: "A public wedding! Oh! what a *gauntlet* for any woman of delicacy to run! Everybody spoke against a public wedding as the most shocking thing in the world." The Act required that all marriages should take place in a parish church after the banns had been published for three successive Sundays. The archbishop alone could grant licences exempting from this rule, but he might not grant them to minors without the consent of the parent or guardian. The Act fell hardly on the Nonconformists, whose ministers might not perform the marriage ceremony, but it continued in force till the nineteenth century.

The Court

So uncertain was the drift of popular opinion, and so fierce was the spirit of opposition when once excited, that the influences which controlled fashion in the first period of George III's reign are hard to detect. The influence of the Court fluctuated, and rarely was of more than secondary importance in determining the current of social feeling.

George III.'s popularity now waxed, now waned, so that he seldom knew whether to be prepared for an assassin or for an ovation when he appeared in public. The total change in the moral tone of the inner circle at Court, which was due to the king and queen's love of domesticity, had not the far-reaching effects that might have been expected. The change had an influence on the middle classes, but not on the upper classes, or on the outer circle of the Court. From the time of the queen's marriage, in her seventeenth year, it was found that she hated "the manners of the times and all our fashionable crimes." But she had little power to make virtue prepossessing. When she had held her drawing-room twice a week and given a State ball twice a year she felt she had done her work; accordingly, the world of fashion voted attendance at Court a tiresome duty. The king and queen were frigid and formal in public, and stood much on their dignity; their warm-heartedness was known only to a few of their private friends, not even to all their own children. Hence they had no power to set the fashion; they could make definite enactments against abuses, but could not stop them. They forbade gambling in the royal palaces, but the gambling mania went on, and, in 1786, Walpole writes: "Even the loss of £100,000 is not rare enough to be surprising."

The king and queen liked quiet dress, but it was their eldest son and the Opposition that set the fashion. The "macaronis," led by Fox, were imitated at more or less distance by all who affected the "ton." About 1772 a rage for eccentricity led men to seek variety of cut and ornament in their dress, but the main features did not change till the next period. The macaronis and "jessamies" tried a waistcoat reaching only to the waist, but the long waistcoat held its own. In the material and trimming of the wide-skirted, wide-cuffed coat there was scope for variety. "What! did he address you in a coat not worth looking at? What a shabby wretch!" says Evelina's partner at a dance, when she refuses to identify a certain gentleman. Men's clothes were noticed as much as women's, and correspondence on the subject has been preserved. Walpole writes to a friend, in 1761: "I have chosen your coat, a claret colour, but I have fixed nothing about the lace," for he could not determine rashly. He enters into the respective

**Men's  
Dress.**


merits of real lace at 20s. a yard, of wide and narrow gauze-lace, of the second order of gauze-lace, tarnished stuff, which he declares is mere frippery and out of fashion.

**Hair  
Dressing.**

In 1765 peruke-makers were noticing with some agitation that men of fashion were beginning to wear their own hair. The citizen still wore his scratch-wig, untoupéd, with rows of little curls round the neck, but fashionable men let their own hair grow long, tied it in a pig-tail, drew it up in a high toupé over the forehead, and made two rolls of curls or "clubs" on each side of the face. With the pig-tail was worn the "solitaire," a piece of black ribbon tied round the throat and fastened at the back of the neck.

**Women's  
Dress.**

Women were wearing a singular combination of the saque and the hoop; the upper garment was open in front, and flowed loosely from the shoulders, whence it trailed behind, or was gathered up in the wearer's hand, displaying the bulging lines of the hoop-petticoat, encircled with furbelows, puffings, or rigid geometrical ornament. The sleeves of the tight bodice reached to the elbow, whence dangled fringe or lace. Out of doors the "Joseph," or long coat, had superseded the "manteau." In 1744, when hoops were enormous, women's heads were dressed to appear phenomenally small. A little close-fitting cap was worn, and if the lady was dressed in "the milk-maid taste," then esteemed "tonnish," a little straw-hat. A reaction set in, and by 1767 enormous structures of horsehair began to be worn, powdered with a mixture of pomatum and meal. In 1776-83 there were "heads" or "pompons" a yard high, upon which were displayed ribbons, lace, butterflies in spun-glass—even, it is recorded, a sow with a litter of pigs. In front was stuck a tall ostrich-feather, curling forwards. The queen forbade "plume-headed" ladies to appear at Court, but without avail. Her own daughters wore plumes, and later, as the "head" diminished, the number of plumes increased to three. The "head," once dressed by the hairdresser, was not to be taken down for a mere whim; and ladies were suspected of sleeping in them for many successive nights. In the daytime the whole erection was tied up in a "mob," a "fly-cap" *à la Thérèse*, or in the "Ranelagh mob" of "gauze minionett." The ends of the gauze were crossed under the chin, and fastened at the back of the head, after the fashion then prevailing among




The Stableyard Macaroni, 1773.



The Bird of Paradise, 1772.

ECCENTRICITIES OF FASHION ABOUT 1773.—I.



The Nosegay Macaroni, 1773.

Covent Garden market women, who had, however, less hair to cover.

The years 1760-85 were characterised by a marked improvement in the position of women with intellectual and social abilities. Their interests were no longer confined to amusements, domestic economy and dress. It was in 1750 that Mrs. Montagu (p. 198; in her unmarried days Elizabeth Robinson, the friend of Mrs. Delany and of the Duchess of Portland) began to attempt a reform of manners by having




*The Contrast. Or a Lady in a Dress of 1745 & another in a Dress of 1772.*

(The "Oxford Magazine," 1772).

The Blue  
Stockings.

parties "where cards could not be thought of," evening assemblies "where the fair sex might participate in conversation with literary and ingenious men." In 1757 the word "blue-stocking," as applied to those who attended such parties, first occurs in her letters. Benjamin Stillingfleet came in morning dress, wearing his grey worsted stockings and not the black silk required in evening dress. Admiral Boscawen applied the term "blue-stocking" to the whole society with its original contemptuous meaning. The society accepted it, declaring that without Stillingfleet's blue stockings their parties were never complete. From 1770-85 the "blues" were in their heyday. Mrs. Montagu was esteemed by Wrexall the Madane du Deffind of the English capital, and he describes the *gens de lettres*, or Blue-stockings, as "a very numerous, powerful, compact phalanx



A St. James's Beauty, 1773.



A Female Macaroni, 1773.



The Female Pyramid.  
(The "Oxford Magazine," 1771.)

in the midst of London." Mrs. Vesey, another clever hostess, made it her object to break up the formal "circle" which had long been fashionable at literary parties. She would have no holding-forth, no reading aloud of new works, and set all the chairs in groups of three, to the great amusement of Miss Burney. Mrs. Chapone<sup>1</sup> made up for her want of personal



MRS. ELIZABETH MONTAGU.

(After Sir J. Reynolds.)

charm by her "most superiorly unaffected nature," but her parties were too bookish for Miss Burney's taste, who thought that "a little rattling would prodigiously mend matters." To this group belonged nearly all the lady authors — Hannah More; Elizabeth Carter, who translated Epictetus; Hannah Cowley, author of the "Belle's Stratagem"; Mrs. Thrale, and, of course, Frances Burney. Aristocratic ladies and famous

beauties were also proud to belong to the circle where Horace Walpole and Dr. Johnson and Edmund Burke might be heard talking their best. The death of Dr. Johnson was a blow from which the circle never recovered; in 1785 the originators of the movement were getting old women; they had done their work and smoothed the way for the younger generation. Time was when intelligence in a woman was only considered pardonable when accompanied by remarkable beauty or personal charm. It was now no longer necessary to join the Blues to reap the benefit of that particular natural gift; it was acceptable everywhere.

[<sup>1</sup> *Née* Mulso: a contributor to Johnson's *Rambler*, and authoress of a once celebrated work, "Letters on the Improvement of the Mind," 1773.]



"BE NOT AMAZED, DEAR MOTHER! IT IS INDEED YOUR DAUGHTER ANNE."





THE Jacobite episode is one of the best and most widely known in Scottish annals. It has enriched the national literature with the picturesque features of romance, while art and music have not yet exhausted its sources of humour and pathos. Issuing from the solitudes of Lochaber, the rising of '45 swept across the

JAMES  
COLVILLE.  
Scotland.



MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.

1. Forester's horn of carved ivory (German). 2. Kit (pocket violin) and bow, by Blumenhagen, 1753. 3. Sackbut (trombone), by Schmied, of Pfaffendorf. 4. English horn (cor Anglais), early form (Italian). 5. Bassoon, by Stanesby Junior, of London, 1747. 6. Tenor hautboy, by Milhouse, of Newark. 7. Spinet (wing-shaped), by Baker Harris, of London. 8. Orchestral handhorn (English). 9. English flute (recorder), by Stanesby, of London. 10. German flute, by Oberlender. 11. Clarionet (early form). 12. Clarinet, by Bland and Weller, of London. 13. Serpent (early form).

(By permission of the Rev. F. W. Galpin, M.A.)

peace-loving Lowlands with the rapidity of a Border foray. Perth, Stirling, Edinburgh, were passed in quick succession; the feeble garrison of dragoons, to whom an ill-informed Government had left the post of danger, fled from the stubble-fields of

Prestonpans before the gleam of the claymore ; and the clansmen crowded in easy triumph through the gates of Carlisle. But the hopeless march into the Midlands served only to show that centuries separated the Southron from the social forces of clan life. Aliens in speech and garb, the clansmen inspired terror instead of confidence. Long before Derby was reached retreat became a necessity, and, though the journey hillwards again was lightened by the brilliant discomfiture of Hawley at Falkirk, the desperate close on Culloden Moor (1746 ; p. 256) was inevitable. The rash prince, skulking from the toils and evading capture only by extreme privations, was made to suffer bitterly but not undeservedly for an enterprise which, if we remember that a generation did not suffice to efface its deadly hurts, was nothing short of criminal. Charles Edward Stuart, for whom the Jacobites had done and suffered so much, ended an inglorious career not unfittingly in 1789 on the eve of that French Revolution which was so soon to make such havoc of the "divinity that doth hedge a king."

Consequences of  
the '45.

The solution of the problem, how to convert Scotland from a source of danger to one of safety to the realm, formed a new departure in English politics and taught the value of remedial legislation. For a while, however, it looked as if the old methods were to prevail in the hands of the sanguinary Cumberland, who wrote, a few days after Culloden, "If we had destroyed every man, such is the soil, rebellion would sprout again should a new system of government not be found out." Stern repression was, however, for a time the order of the day. An Act against Episcopacy imposed many vexatious disabilities on the nonjuring clergy. A Disarming Act punished a first offence with a heavy fine and six months in prison, and a second with seven years' transportation, while it struck at clan sentiment by similar penalties for wearing the tartan in kilt or plaid. But Chancellor Hardwicke's Bill for abolishing heritable jurisdictions (1747) helped largely to adapt the social life of Scotland to modern conditions. The Crown had of old divested itself of nearly all the functions of local justice in favour of the barons, thus giving rise to a system of lucrative fines in the hands of hereditary sheriffs. The compensation of £152,000 consoled the territorial magnates for the loss of feudal power, and aided in that improvement of estates which so greatly helped the material progress of

the century. Following upon the abolition of the Lords of the Articles (1690; IV., p. 835), this Act completed the defeudalising process. Along with this measure President Forbes secured another equally statesmanlike. This was to vest in the Crown the Forfeited Estates, collect the rents through factors,



PRINCE CHARLES EDWARD IN DISGUISE.


*(From an engraving by J. Williams.)*

and use the proceeds for the permanent improvement of the Highlands. For some years after the date of this Commission (1752) judicial rents were strictly enforced and evictions carried out with military aid. There was, however, a singular absence of agrarian crime, save the case of the shooting of Campbell of Glenure, so picturesquely treated in Stevenson's "Kidnapped." The recruiting of Highland regiments for foreign service turned the warlike sentiments of both chiefs and clansmen into the

most effective aids in the expansion of the empire. Deported Highlanders settled down as excellent colonists, while retired officers turned their savings to the best account in the improvement of estates. From the peace of 1763 we date, indeed, the first start in material prosperity, and this, coupled with the Montgomery Act (1770), modifying entails, and the repeal of the Disarming Act (1784), effectually salved the sores of the '45.

Government.

For thirty years following the '45 Scotland gave no serious



LORD LOVAT'S EXECUTION: PORTION OF THE SCAFFOLD.

(By permission of the Elder Brethren, Trinity House, London.)

trouble. The war policy of Chatham and North made the country only too well acquainted with the horrors of the press-gang. This and the smuggling born of an unwise fiscal system formed a frequent source of local disturbance. Thurot's futile landing in the Isle of Man (1755) was the first threat of French invasion and led to the Militia Bill (1757; p. 232). Its extension to Scotland was keenly supported (1760), but the Government hesitated to arm a country so recently in rebellion. Not till 1793 was Scotland trusted with a share in the national defence.

Meantime a strong party looked upon the rejection of the measure as an insult. Out of this offended national sentiment arose the Poker Club in Edinburgh, of whose early days Dr. Alexander Carlyle has so much to say. It was notable as the first stirring of healthy public feeling. Less justifiable excitement arose over the Catholic Relief Bill (1778; p. 240), giving expression as it did to prejudices which were nowhere stronger than in Scotland.

P. W.  
JOYCE.  
Ireland.

Party  
Warfare.

IN the Irish Parliament there were all along two leading parties. The Court party included the chief officials, from the Lord-Lieutenant down, nearly all Englishmen, and all in the English interest. Taking their orders from the other side, they passed, or endeavoured to pass, every measure suggested to them from England. But there was always a determined Opposition, generally small—the “Patriots,” or “Patriotic Party,” as they came to be called—who were for independent action, and resisted all dictation; and they were supported by some very able and brilliant men from the outside. The leading feature in the political history of Ireland during the period comprised in this chapter was the struggle of the Patriotic Party for free trade and legislative independence, which eventuated in Grattan’s Parliament of 1782. It is necessary to bear in mind that this long and bitter struggle was maintained exclusively by Protestants. The Catholics, forming four-fifths of the population, had no franchise, no representation, no political existence; so that they were absolutely shut out from taking any part in these spirit-stirring contests. The laws against them, indeed, appear to have been too much for human nature, either to enforce stringently on the one hand, or to bear on the other; and the cruel intentions of the legislators were, all along, to some extent frustrated by the good feeling and compassion of the general body of Protestants.

The contest of the two Parliamentary parties went on incessantly; the Patriots were sleepless and active, and gained strength from year to year; a spirit of independence gradually spread abroad; and the people began to have some confidence in the power of Parliament to do good. There was now no longer any desire for legislative union with England (p. 223); on the contrary, when, in 1759, it was rumoured that union was in contemplation, there was a terrible riot in Dublin.

The oppression of the peasantry by the local gentry—who were always backed by the law—added greatly to the misery arising from loss of trade. They charged exorbitant rents; enclosed as their private property the commons which belonged, from old times, to the people; and in some parts of the country they forced the farmers and labourers to work without pay at making and repairing roads, giving no help themselves. The people, driven at last to desperation—Catholics and Protestants,

**Secret  
Societies.**

north and south—formed themselves into secret oathbound societies to redress their grievances by force. There were White-boys in the south, who were joined by both Catholics and Protestants; among the Protestants of the north there were “Steel-boys” and “Hearts of Oak;” and among Catholics “Defenders.” These societies, passing beyond their original functions, did great mischief, and sometimes committed terrible cruelties.

**Presby-  
terian  
Emigra-  
tion.**

More than half a century before this time the Presbyterians of Ulster had begun to emigrate in great numbers to New England, driven from the country partly by want of employment after the suppression of the wool trade (IV., p. 850), and partly by the religious persecution they endured under the Test and Schism Acts. This emigration still continued; and though the English Government were much troubled at the loss of the very flower of the Ulster Protestants, and at the resulting relative increase of the Catholics, they obstinately refused to repeal the objectionable statutes, even in face of the earnest recommendations of successive Lord-Lieutenants. When, subsequently, the American war broke out the most determined and dangerous of the troops who fought under Washington against England were the sturdy expatriated Presbyterians and the sons and grandsons of the older Puritan colonists.

**The Volun-  
teers.**

The American war had a most important influence on the affairs of Ireland. Nearly all the troops had to be withdrawn, and the country was left unprotected at the very time when American privateers were doing much damage round the Irish coasts and a foreign invasion on a large scale was feared. The Irish saw that, if they were to be protected at all, they must protect themselves; and for this purpose they began to enrol themselves as Volunteers. The movement originated in Belfast in 1779 and spread rapidly; and companies were formed in the four provinces, till ultimately they numbered 100,000 men, with Lord Charlemont as commander-in-chief. Their sympathies were entirely with the Patriots—indeed, the movement was initiated by that party, and accordingly the Government viewed it with suspicion and disfavour; but the feeling of the country was so strong that they were forced to acquiesce. They even went so far as to supply arms, though sorely against their will; but uniforms and all other expenses were supplied by the people



LORD CARLISLE AND HIS FAMILY IN PHOENIX PARK, BY F. WHEATLEY.  
(By permission of the Right Hon. the Earl of Carlisle.)



This was an exclusively Protestant movement, the Catholics not yet being permitted to take any positions of trust.

Free  
Trade.

The Patriotic Party in Parliament were at this time led by two great men—Henry Grattan and Henry Flood. With the Volunteers at their back the party now gained more confidence than ever. On the assembling of Parliament in 1779, Grattan, in an Amendment to the Address, demanded free trade, and the following motion was carried:—"That it is not by temporary expedients, but by a free trade alone, that this nation is now to be saved from impending ruin." The motion was supported by all Ireland; and the Government, with the American war going against them, and France and Spain hostile, could no longer resist the concession of justice. It belonged, however, to the English Parliament, who had imposed the restraints, to remove them; and in 1779 Lord North had certain propositions passed, which permitted the free export of woollen and other manufactures from Ireland, and allowed free trade with the colonies. Thus was Irish trade relieved from its worst restrictions. But the mischief had been done; the main industries had been crushed beyond recovery; and to this day Ireland suffers the evil consequences, in the general absence of manufactures and commerce, and in the resulting undue competition for land.

Catholic  
Disabili-  
ties  
Relaxed.

Under the pressure of the American war, some of the worst provisions of the laws against Catholics were also removed (p. 230). In 1778 the law which gave the whole property to the eldest son who became a Protestant was repealed: and the Catholics also obtained the right to lease land for 999 years. Soon afterwards the Test Act (IV., p. 849) was repealed, which was a relief to Dissenters as well as to Catholics.

Grattan's  
Parlia-  
ment.

The ideas of the Popular Party grew with their success, and they now resolved that their Parliament should be free. This, however, they found a harder task. In 1780 Grattan moved that the king, with the Lords and Commons of Ireland, are the only power on earth competent to enact laws to bind Ireland. But the Government were able, by the usual corrupt agencies, to secure a majority against him, though even the Earl of Carlisle, who soon afterwards became Lord Lieutenant, privately declared during his term of office that "the practicability of governing Ireland by English laws is quite visionary." Grattan next determined to make the Volunteers heard; and

under the management of Lord Charlemont, Flood, and himself, a meeting of 242 delegates from 143 Volunteer Corps of Ulster was held in Dungannon on the 15th February, 1782, where decisive resolutions were passed in favour of legislative



HENRY FLOOD.

*(By permission of the Right Hon. the Earl of Rosse.)*

independence and a perfectly free and open trade. These resolutions were adopted by all the Volunteer Corps of Ireland. At the same time a further measure of relief for Catholics was passed in the Irish Parliament, permitting them to buy and sell land, and to open schools; and, among other measures, the law prohibiting a Catholic from having a horse worth more than £5 was repealed.

Parliament met in Dublin on the 16th April, 1782, when Grattan moved, in an amendment to the Address, the substance of the Dungannon resolutions. The Government party saw that further opposition was useless, and might be dangerous, and the amendment was unanimously agreed to. This was immediately followed, in the English Parliament, by a repeal of the Sixth of George I. (p. 223). This "Act of Repeal," as it was called, was generally understood to include the repeal of Poynings' Law; and it was shortly afterwards followed by the "Act of Renunciation," declaring that Ireland's right to make her own laws was fully established, and was never again to be questioned. This completed the freedom of the Irish Parliament.



A FIGHTING PRELATE.

## AUTHORITIES.—1742-1784.

## GENERAL HISTORY.

Lecky, *History of England in the Eighteenth Century*; Lord Mahon, *History of England since the Peace of Utrecht*; Erskine May, *Constitutional History*; Abbey and Overton, *The English Church in the Eighteenth Century*. These biographies are most useful:—Fitzmaurice, *Life of Shelburne*; Albemarle, *Rockingham and his Contemporaries*; Longman, *Frederick the Great*; Macaulay, *Essays on Chatham, Pitt, Warren Hastings, Clive, and Frederick the Great*. Original Authorities.—Hervey, *Memoirs of George II.*; Horace Walpole, *Memoirs and Letters to Sir Horace Mann*; *Letters of Junius*; *Correspondence of George III. and Lord North*; Burke, *Thoughts on the Present Discontent, and Speeches on America*; Rockingham, *Memoirs*; Emily Osborne, *Political and Social Letters of a Lady of the Eighteenth Century*; *The Bedford Correspondence*; *Diaries and Correspondence of the Earl of Malmesbury*; *The Grenville Papers*; *Narrative of Changes in the Ministry, 1765-1767, told by the Duke of Newcastle in Letters to John White, M.P.*, ed. by Miss Bateson; *Autobiography and Correspondence of the third Duke of Grafton*, ed. by Sir W. Anson.

## SPECIAL SUBJECTS.

*Military History*, as in c. xvii. *The Navy and Exploration*, see lists for c. xix.

*Nonconformity and the Wesleyan Movement, 1714-1815.*—*History of the Dissenting Deputies* (1813); *Test Act Reporter* (1829); *Parliamentary Return of Dissenters' Places of Worship registered between 1688 and 1852* (1853, No 156); Dr. Stoughton, *Religion under Queen Anne and the Georges*; Skeats, *History of the Free Churches*; Waddington, *Congregational History, 1700-1801*; Dr. Hulley, *Lancashire: Its Puritanism and Nonconformity*; Tyerman, *Life of John Wesley*; Smith, *History of Wesleyan Methodism*; D. Butler, *Wesley and Whitfield in Scotland*.

*Literature, 1715-1784.*—Grose, *History of Eighteenth Century Literature*; Leslie Stephen, *History of English Thought in the Eighteenth Century*; Thackeray, *English Humourists*; Hazlitt, *English Poets and Comic Writers*; Elwin and Courthope's edition of Pope; Boswell, *Life of Johnson*, with the notes of its various commentators.

*Art, 1715-1815.*—Austin Dobson, *Hogarth* (contains a bibliography); Leslie and Taylor, *Life of Reynolds*; also—works on Reynolds by Northcote, Claude Phillips, and Pulling; on Gainsborough, by Fletcher and Brock-Arnold; Hilda Gamlin, *George Romney*; the historical notes by F. (†) Stephens to the catalogues of the "Reynolds and Gainsborough," and the "Century of English Art" Exhibitions; Gilchrist, *Life of Blake*; Wright, *History of Caricature and Grotesque*; Grego, *Rowlandson the Caricaturist*, and *The Works of James Gillray the Caricaturist*; Cunningham, *Lives of Painters and Sculptors*; articles in *Dictionary of National Biography*; R. and S. Redgrave, *A Century of Painters*; E. Chesneau, *La Peinture Anglaise*; Cook, *Handbook to the National Gallery*; F. Wedmore, *Studies in English Art*; F. H. Ward, *English Art in the Public Galleries*.

*Science and Philosophy and Agriculture* as in c. xvii.

*Manufactures.*—The authorities cited in c. xvii; also—Cotton: *Histories of the Cotton Manufacture*, by E. Baines and R. Guest; F. Espinasse, *Lancashire Worthies*; Woodcroft, *Inventors of Machines for the Manufacture of Textile Fabrics*; French, *Life and Times of Crompton*. *The Steam Engine*: Smiles, *Lives of the Engineers and lives of Boulton and of Watt*; R. H. Thurston, *History of the Steam Engine*; Farey, *Treatise on the Steam Engine*. *Coal-mining and Smelting with Coke*: Diet. Nat. Biography, article "Darby"; J. Percy, *Iron and Steel*; Roscoe and Schorlemmer, *Chemistry: A Treatise on Coal Mining* (1769). Galloway, *History of Coal Mining in Great Britain*; Boyd, *History of the Coal Trade*. *Ceramics*: Meteyard, *Life of Josiah*

*Wedgwood*; L. Jewitt, *Lives of the Wedgwoods and Ceramic Art*; Prideaux, *Relics of Cookworthy*. On the whole period, see Cunningham, *English Industry and Commerce*. Canals.—Smiles, *Lives of the Engineers*; Philips, *Inland Navigation*; Gibbins, *Industry in England*.

*Finance*.—See list for c. xix.

*Pauperism, Labour, etc.*—Besides the ordinary histories and memoirs, the most useful books are—Eden, *State of the Poor*; Burn, *The Poor Laws* (1764); Nicholls, *History of the English Poor Law* (new ed., 1898); Aschrott, *The English Poor Law System*; Fowle, *The English Poor Law* ("Citizen" series); the *Parliamentary History*; the *Commons Journals* (especially 1773 and 1778–79); Dr. John Brown, *Estimate, etc.* (1757); also particularly Adam Smith, *Wealth of Nations*, and Arthur Young's *Tours*, and among modern books, S. and B. Webb, *Trade Unions*; Brentano on *Guilds*; Howell, *Capital and Labour*; Pike, *History of Crime*; W. C. Sydney, *England in the Eighteenth Century*; Cunningham, *English Industry and Commerce*; Thorold Rogers, *Six Centuries of Work and Wages*.

*Social Life, Manners, Costume, etc.*, 1742–1815.—*General*: Various works by W. Andrews, e.g. *Bygone England*, *Bygone Derbyshire*, *Bygone Yorkshire*, etc.; Lecky, *History of England in the Eighteenth Century*, i.–vi.; Miss Berry, *Social Condition of England and France*; Stone, *Chronicles of Fashion*; Browne, *Estimate* (1758); Wale, *My Grandfather's Pocket-book*, 1701–96 (London, 1883); Miss Martineau, *History of the Peace*; Oliphant, *Historical Sketches*; George Paston, *Little Memoirs of the Eighteenth Century*. Collections: e.g. Ashton, *Old Times*, *Down of the Nineteenth Century in England*, *English Caricature and Napoleon I.*; *Annual Register*; *Gomme, Gentleman's Magazine Library*; Place, *MS. Collections* (Add. MSS. 27,827). Letters: *On the Present State of England* (1772), of the Countess of Suffolk (ed. Croker), of Horace Walpole, Earl of Orford (ed. Cunningham), of Lady Hervey (ed. Croker), of Lord Chesterfield, of Mrs. Montague, of Maria Edgeworth (ed. Hare). *Lives*—of Chesterfield, by Maty; of Fielding, by Lawrence; of Hogarth, by Nichols; of Mrs. Carter, by Pennington; of the Countess of Huntingdon; of Mrs. Chapone; and of Wilberforce; Boswell, *Life of Samuel Johnson* (ed. Birkbeck Hill). Diaries: e.g. of Miss Burney (Madame D'Arblay); Wesley, *Journal* (4 vols. London, 1827). Memoirs: e.g. Sir Lascelles Wrasall, Tate Wilkinson (4 vols. York, 1790); Walpole (ed. Russell Barker). Reminiscences: e.g. Angelo, Miller. *Retrospect*; Mozley, *Village Life*. *Special Topics* (arranged alphabetically).—*Coaching*: Malet, *Annals of the Road*; Thrupp, *History of Coaches*. *Commerce*: McCulloch, *Account of the British Empire*; Macpherson, *Annals of Commerce*; Craik, *History of British Commerce*. *Cookery*: Books by Mrs. Glasse, B. Clermont, Mrs. Randall. *Country Clergy*: Twining, R., *The Recreations and Studies of a Country Clergyman in the Eighteenth Century*, and other works; Goldsmith, *Vicar of Wakefield*. *The Court*: J. H. Jesse, *Memoirs of the Court of England to the Death of George II.*, and also of George III.; Walpole, *Letters*; Lord Hervey's *Correspondence*; Thackeray, *The Four Georges*. *Dress*: Fairholt; Ashton (works cited above); Sangster, *Umbrellas*. *Fleet Marriages*: by J. Southarden Burns. *Foreigners in England*: Works by Angeloni and Moritz (in Pinkerton's Collection, ii.); Sirmond, Duc de Levis, *England at the Beginning of the Nineteenth Century*. *Journalism*: Grant, *History of the Newspaper Press*; Hunt, *Fourth Estate*. *Local History*: Roberts, *Southern Counties*; Sutton, *History of Nottingham*; Langford, *A Century of Birmingham Life*; Arthur Young's *Tours*. London: Pennant (1790); Jesse; Maitland; Timbs, *Club Life in London*. Welsh, *Modern History of the City of London, 1760–1867*; Sir Walter Besant, *London in the Eighteenth Century*. *Novels*: W. Raleigh, *The English Novel* (1894). *Police*: Colquhoun; Fielding, *Increase of Robbers*; On the *Police of 1753*; Pike, *History of Crime*. *Smuggling*: Sussex *Archæological Collections*, x.; *Reports of Parliamentary Committees*; Shore, *Smuggling Days and Smuggling Ways*. *Travel*: Norway, *History of the Post Office Packet Service*. *Scotland and Ireland*.—See lists for c. xix.











